


**STATE OF MARYLAND**  
**OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT**  
**AND FAMILY PRESERVATION RESOURCE PLAN:**  
**Fiscal Year 2010**



**Prepared by:**  
**The Governor's Office for Children**  
**on Behalf of**  
**The Children's Cabinet**

**Submitted on**  
**December 6, 2010**

# *Acknowledgements*

The following persons provided invaluable assistance with this report:

## Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

Susan Bradley, Mental Hygiene Administration  
Michael Chapman, Developmental Disabilities Administration  
Anna Jones, Developmental Disabilities Administration  
Tom Merrick, Mental Hygiene Administration  
Bette Anne Mobley, Developmental Disabilities Administration  
William Rusinko, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration  
Al Zachik, Mental Hygiene Administration

## Department of Human Resources

David Ayer, Social Services Administration  
Linda Carter, Social Services Administration  
Carnitra White, Social Services Administration

## Department of Juvenile Services

Bill Drollinger, Fiscal Planning and Management  
Lakshmi Iyengar, Research and Evaluation  
John Irvine, Research and Evaluation  
Kwai Yiu Leung, Research and Evaluation  
Melissa Liszewski, Fiscal Planning and Management

## Governor's Office for Children

Shanda Crowder, Chief, Interagency Initiatives  
Deborah Donohue, Principal Counsel  
Dennis Eichenlaub, IT Systems Analyst  
Scott Finkelsen, Chief, Finance and Operations  
Rosemary King Johnston, Executive Director  
Kim Malat, Chief, Grant and Contract Administration  
Sarah Reiman, Interagency Specialist  
Mark Scott, Administrative Assistant, Interagency Initiatives  
Antoinette Thomas, Chief Information Officer

## Maryland State Department of Education

Alice Harris, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services  
Jodi King, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services  
Jeff Miller, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

For further information or copies of this report, please visit the Governor's Office for Children's website at [www.goc.maryland.gov](http://www.goc.maryland.gov).

# Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	2
Background .....	5
Data Collection Methodology .....	7
Report Overview .....	11
Overview .....	14
Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) Summary Data: State of Maryland .....	14
Overall Number of OOHP .....	16
Demographic Summary: Gender, Age, and Race .....	20
Overall Costs associated with OOHP .....	22
Rate of Entry by Jurisdiction for OOHP .....	24
Agency Overviews .....	25
<i>DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) OVERVIEW</i> .....	26
<i>DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) OVERVIEW</i> .....	34
<i>Section III: Family Home Settings</i> .....	40
Overview .....	40
Family Home Settings: Statewide Summary .....	43
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) .....	45
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) .....	53
<i>Section IV: Community-Based Residential Programs</i> .....	57
Overview .....	57
Community-Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary .....	61
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ADMINISTRATION (DDA) .....	62
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) .....	68
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) .....	75
<i>Section V: Non-Community Based Residential Placements</i> .....	79
Overview .....	79
Non-Community Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary .....	82
ALCOHOL AND DRUG AND ABUSE ADMINISTRATION (ADAA) .....	83
MENTAL HYGIENE ADMINISTRATION (MHA) .....	88
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) .....	98

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (MSDE) .....	102
The Maryland School for the Deaf .....	103
The Maryland School for the Blind .....	104
<i>Section VI: Hospitalizations</i> .....	110
Overview .....	110
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) .....	112
DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS).....	115
<i>Section VII: Family Preservation Services</i> .....	118
<i>Section VIII: Children’s Cabinet Resource Development Initiatives &amp; Conclusion</i> .....	133
Resource Development Initiatives .....	133
Conclusion .....	141
Appendix A: Placements by Jurisdiction for All Placement Categories.....	142
Appendix B: Capacity and Utilization by Placement Category & Agency .....	165



# *Section I: Introduction & Overview*

## **Background**

The State faces the challenge of linking children served in out-of-home care with placements and services that meet their needs. It is important that the State conducts ongoing, unified and comprehensive reviews of the placements and provision of services provided to children placed in our care. This has historically been accomplished through the submission of two annual reports: The State Resource Plan and the Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) and Family Preservation Report. During the planning process for these annual reports, it became apparent to the Children's Cabinet that the overlapping requirements of both reports could most efficiently be addressed through one consolidated report. On behalf of the Children's Cabinet, staff of the Governor's Office for Children (GOC) met with analysts from the Department of Legislative Services (DLS) to discuss the data requirements and proposed consolidation of the two reports. It was agreed that one comprehensive report should be submitted on December 1 of each year. The Children's Cabinet and the General Assembly approved this consolidated framework for addressing the legislative reporting requirements.

The purpose of the newly titled Out-of-Home Placement and Family Preservation Resource Plan (The Report) is to document the State's capacity for and utilization of out-of-home placements, analyze the costs associated with out-of-home placements, facilitate an evaluation of Statewide family preservation programs, and identify areas of need across Maryland. The Report fulfills the requirements, pursuant to the Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services Article, §8-703, to produce annually a State Resource Plan "in order to enhance access to services provided by residential child care programs" and the Joint Chairmen's Report requesting an evaluation of "Maryland's family preservation programs in stemming the flow of children from their homes."

The Fiscal Year 2010 (FY10) Out-of-Home Placement and Family Preservation Resource Plan (The Report) represents a consolidation of the two reports referenced above. The Report reflects information as reported by the child-serving agencies including the Departments of Human Resources (DHR), Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH), Juvenile Services (DJS) and the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE).

In Maryland, children enter out-of-home care for a variety of reasons and under a number of different circumstances. Children may be placed in the care and custody of the State when they are determined to be a Child In Need of Assistance (CINA), a Child In Need of Supervision (CINS), or Delinquent. Children can also enter placement through a Voluntary Placement Agreement (VPA) in which a parent voluntarily places a child in the care of the State. This most often occurs when a child is unable to access funding for needed treatment through any avenue other than being in the care of the State. The State Child-Serving Agencies and Administrations responsible for placing children in out-of-home placements are the DHR through the Local

Departments of Social Services (LDSS); the DJS; and the DHMH, including the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA), Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA), and the Mental Hygiene Administration (MHA). Although the MSDE funds out-of-home placements made by the Local School Systems (LSS), MSDE is not a placement agency and does not place children out-of-home. Children, whose placements are funded by MSDE either in whole or in part, however, will be discussed in this report along with children placed by the other Agencies and Administrations. These Agencies and Administrations may fund the placements or the placements may be funded by Medical Assistance (MA), which is administered within DHMH. Placements may also be co-funded by several State Agencies.

Each of these child-placing and funding Agencies and Administrations operates differently at the local level. DHMH (ADAA and MHA), DHR, and MSDE serve children and families through their 24 local counterparts within each of the jurisdictions - the LDSS, the local Core Service Agencies (CSAs)<sup>1</sup>, the local Substance Abuse Councils, and the LSS. DJS and DDA have regional offices, which, in turn, have local offices. The regions designated by DJS and DDA are different with DJS having six regions and DDA four. Those regions are:

### **DJS**

- Baltimore City
- Central Region (Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, and Howard Counties)
- Metro Region (Montgomery and Prince George's Counties)
- Eastern Shore Region (Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico and Worcester Counties)
- Southern Region (Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles and St. Mary's Counties)
- Western Region (Allegany, Frederick, Garrett and Washington Counties)

### **DDA**

- Central Region (Anne Arundel County, Baltimore City, and Baltimore, Harford and Howard Counties)
- Eastern Shore Region (Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico and Worcester Counties)
- Southern Region (Calvert, Charles, St. Mary's, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties)
- Western Region (Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett and Washington Counties)

---

<sup>1</sup> One Core Service Agency located on the Eastern Shore serves five jurisdictions.

## **Data Collection Methodology**

An Out-of-Home Placement Interagency Workgroup (Workgroup) was convened by the Children's Cabinet throughout Fiscal Year 2010 (FY10) to review the Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09) data collection methodology and develop a more specific work plan for all data elements including reporting guidelines and submission requirements. Representatives of each Agency participated in the planning and development of the current report.

This is the first year that GOC on behalf of the Children's Cabinet (CC) did not require the submission of detailed raw data from each Agency. Rather, GOC requested aggregate data and corresponding narrative. Each individual Agency was responsible for submitting aggregate data and developing corresponding narrative for the data provided. This new data collection process builds on the efforts of the FY09 report to ensure that data included in the Report consistently and accurately reflect the status of out-of-home placements across the State. The Fiscal Year and One-day count data used to develop this report will be available electronically on GOC's website.

### **2009 vs. 2010 Report**

Data collection for FY10 varies from the FY09 report in that GOC received aggregate, rather than raw, placement data from the agencies. The 2009 report was based on detailed placement and children data submitted by each Agency and analyzed by GOC to:

1. match unique children to identify each child receiving services while reducing data duplication; and
2. match primary and secondary placements to determine a single placement when a child received services from multiple agencies during a single placement.

The FY10 report uses aggregate data submitted by each Agency for the fiscal years and one-day placements for each fiscal year as noted in the 2010 Report section below. Accuracy of the 2010 data reporting also depends on the clarity of the data request. The Workgroup initially met with the agencies to discuss reporting needs. Each Agency was provided a data request guide along with data collection templates for data reporting and clarification of the information request. The guidance removed the uncertainty associated with providing the required aggregate data for this year's report. GOC then met individually with each Agency to ensure thorough understanding of reporting requirements as well as the Agency's unique placement process and data collection.

## **2010 Report**

Each child serving Agency was requested to provide aggregate data using specific templates for children in placement and associated cost during the last three fiscal years. The following information defines the parameters of the requested data.

### **Age Group:**

This report considers placement for children through their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday (i.e. age 20.999) on the date of admission for new placements and July 1<sup>st</sup> of the fiscal year for carryover placements. MSDE placements include children who are served through the academic year of their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday.

### **Reporting Period:**

1. **Full Fiscal Year:** All placements during the fiscal year including carryover placements from the prior fiscal year(s). The fiscal year periods are as follows:

Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08): July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008

Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09): July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009

Fiscal Year 2010 (FY10): July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010

2. **1-Day Count:** The one-day count date used for each fiscal year is as follows:

FY08: January 31, 2008

FY09: January 31, 2009

FY10: January 31, 2010

### **Aggregate Data Requested:**

Each Agency submits data corresponding to the full fiscal year and a one-day count. The full Fiscal Year reporting of all placements takes into consideration carryovers from prior fiscal year(s) and duplicated placements. The One-Day Count reports of all placements on January 31<sup>st</sup> of the corresponding fiscal years 2008, 2009 and 2010. All placement admissions and discharges were considered regardless of the placement type.

The data requested for each reporting type are summarized as follows:

1. **Full Fiscal Year :**

- a. ***Jurisdiction Population Flow:*** All placements during the fiscal year per jurisdiction. Identifying, per jurisdiction, placements at start of the fiscal year, new admissions within the fiscal year, discharges within the fiscal year, and placements at the end of the fiscal year.

- b. **Category Population Flow:** All placements within the fiscal year by placement categories. Identifying, per category, placements at start of the fiscal year, new admissions within the fiscal year, discharges within the fiscal year, and placements at the end of the fiscal year.
  - c. **Race Demographics:** All placements within the fiscal year identified by the child's race and also by the placement categories.
  - d. **Gender Demographics:** All placements within the fiscal year identified by the child's gender and also by the placement categories.
  - e. **Cost Data:** Agency cost for all placements during the Fiscal Year including the total placements, number of bed days funded, placement cost, educational cost, and administrative cost. Cost is reflective of all applicable placement types reported by the Agency.
2. **One-Day Count:**
- a. **Placements by Agency and Category:** All placements identified by placement categories and multi-Agency involvement.
  - b. **Gender Demographics:** All placements identified by the child's gender and also by the placement categories.
  - c. **Race Demographics:** All placements identified by the child's race and also by the placement categories.
  - d. **Age Demographics:** All placements identified by the child's age and also by the placement categories.
  - e. **Placement by Category:** All placements identified by the Agency category as defined by the Agency and corresponds to the placement categories and the sub-categories.
  - f. **Capacity Utilization (FY10 Only):** A census of providers serving children in placement January 31, 2010 and their respective number of placements.
  - g. **Placement by Jurisdiction (FY10 Only):** All placements for each sub-category in relation to the child's home jurisdiction and placement jurisdiction.

The placement categories noted in the *Aggregate Data Requested* section on page 7 represent the five-macro-placement categories delineated by the Children's Cabinet within which all types of out-of-home placements in the State are classified. The five categories and associated sub-categories are (family home settings, community-based residential placement, non-community-based residential placement, hospitalization, and unknown). An unknown category is necessary for reporting purposes when the child's automated placement record excludes the placement category.

### Data Usage:

The data submitted by the agencies are reviewed and compiled by GOC to determine state-wide placements.

### Data Duplication and Quality:

The reporting of aggregate data resulted in some service duplication since it is not possible to match unique children and placements. Aggregate data reporting includes multiple services submitted by each Agency for a given placement. For example, a child may receive services from one or more agencies for a specific placement type.

The Placements by Agency and Category allows the Agency to highlight placements where another Agency or agencies, is involved in the placement. However, this reporting does not capture a complete picture of multi-Agency involvement since not all agencies electronically track other participating agencies.

### Verification and Validation

GOC communicates with the agencies to verify reported placements which appear to be abnormally high or low. Informal guidance is provided to individual agencies to further clarify data collection and reporting.

### Data Methodology for Rate Calculations

**Rate** = (Number in sub-group) ÷ (Number in whole group) x MULTIPLIER

**Example: Rate of children entering OOHP per 1,000 children (ages 0-18), Fiscal Year 2010**

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Rate} &= (\text{Number of entries}) \div (\text{Number of children ages 0-18}) \times 1,000 \\ &= (16,356 \div 1,351,935) \times 1,000 \\ &= 12.1 \text{ per 1,000 children birth-18 entered an OOHP in FY10}\end{aligned}$$

**Rate of Change:** It is instructive to see how an indicator has changed over time. The rate of change refers to the degree of change from one time frame to another. Rate of change is expressed as a percentage. A positive percentage indicates an upward trend while a negative percentage denotes a downward trend.

**Rate of Change** = {[ (Recent year number) ÷ (Prior year number)] - 1 } x 100

**Example: Rate of change in the rate of out-of-home placement, FY09 to FY10**

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Rate of Change} &= \{[(\text{FY10 rate of placement}) \div (\text{FY09 rate of placement})] - 1\} \times 100 \\ &= \{[12.1 \div 12.3] - 1\} \times 100 \\ &= -1.5\% \text{ is the rate of change in the rate of placement from FY09 to FY10.}\end{aligned}$$

## Report Overview

The FY10 Report includes a Statewide summary of all out-of-home placements, three-year trend analyses and resource development of out-of-home placements by the Children's Cabinet placement categories for in-state and out-of-State placements, a description of Maryland's Family Preservation Services, and a discussion of placements at Maryland's School for the Blind and School for the Deaf.

It is the intent of the Children's Cabinet that these enhancements to The Report will provide an accurate and precise analysis of the five macro placement categories (described below). As the Children's Cabinet continues to strengthen and develop strategies to serve children in their homes and communities, understanding those children who require out-of-home placement, improving the ways in which we track and monitor placements, and finding meaningful ways to measure progress will assist both the State and local jurisdictions in planning effective services and appropriating funds in the most effective ways.

**It should be noted that this report does not include private Residential Treatment Center (RTC) data. The Mental Hygiene Administration (MHA) is currently in the process of analyzing data on the utilization of private sector RTC beds for the past year. This analysis has been delayed because of the transition of vendors for the Administrative Services Organization (ASO), which authorizes and pays claims on behalf of MHA. GOC will submit an addendum to this report on behalf of MHA and the Children's Cabinet once the data has been validated and analysis completed. In the interim, MHA has chosen to provide data from the publicly operated RTCs, the Regional Institutes for Children and Adolescents (RICAs.)**

### **Placement Categories**

The term "Out-of-home placement" means: (1) the removal of a child from the child's family; and (2) the placement of the child by a cooperating department or court in a public or private residential child care program or treatment foster care home for more than 30 days (Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services Article, §8-1001). The Children's Cabinet delineated five macro-placement categories within which all types of out-of-home placements in the State are classified and reported:

1. **Family Home Settings:** Relative (Kinship) Care, Foster Care, Treatment Foster Care, Pre-Adoptive (Adoptive) Care, Living Arrangement- Family Home, and Individual Family Care
2. **Community-Based Residential Placement:** Independent Living, Living Arrangement- Community Based, and Residential Child Care Programs (RCCPs)
3. **Non-Community-Based Residential Placement:** Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs), Adult Corrections, Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers, Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs, Residential Educational Facilities, Diagnostic Evaluation

Treatment Program, Living Arrangement- Non-Community Based, and Non-Secure/Non-RTC

4. **Hospitalization:** General Hospitalization, Psychiatric Hospitalization and In-Patient Private
5. **Unknown:** Includes children on runaway or Agency automated records not updated.

These categories are utilized in describing Maryland's out-of-home placements as a continuum, beginning with the least restrictive, most family-like setting (Family Home Settings) and moving progressively towards the most highly structured and treatment-oriented settings<sup>2</sup> (Hospitalizations).

Over time, a child, depending on need, may experience multiple placements among the different placement categories. It is not uncommon for a child to enter placement in a relative or kinship care placement (Family Home Settings category) and later require more structured care at a Residential Child Care Program (Community-Based Residential Placement category). Or, a child with a severe mood disorder may be placed in a Therapeutic Group Home, which is a type of Residential Child Care Program (Community-Based Residential Placement category), require psychiatric hospitalization in order to stabilize the serious risk of self-harm (Hospitalization category), and then experience successful intervention at a Residential Treatment Center (Non-Community-Based Residential category). It is always the goal of the child-placing Agency to place children in the least restrictive, most appropriate setting possible.

### **Placement in Home Jurisdiction**

The Children's Cabinet remains committed to the development of local, integrated systems of care to ensure that:

- children and their families are served in a culturally and linguistically competent manner;
- services are community-based and individualized; and
- decisions are child- and youth-guided and family-driven.

Family involvement and relationships suffer when children are placed far from their home. The strain of visiting a child who is far from home, whether measured by actual mileage or the fact that the child is in a placement that is not readily accessible by the family's available means of transportation, affects the child, parents, and siblings. In cases where family reunification is a goal, children may remain in care longer than necessary because of the difficulty associated with making progress toward reunification without face-to-face contact. It should also be noted that for children receiving special education and related services, an out-of-home placement in another jurisdiction may result in a disruption of required education services as determined by their Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

---

<sup>2</sup> Please see COMAR Title 14, Subtitle 31, Chapter 5 for the regulatory definitions of residential child care programs, and COMAR Title 07, Subtitle 02 for the regulatory definitions of programs licensed by DHR.



Even when a child's biological family is not involved in the care of the child, there are typically other community members with a connection to the child, including teachers, counselors, and school friends. The placement of a child into a residence that is not his or her home is sufficiently disruptive without also uprooting the child from his or her established school and community.

Although serving children in their home jurisdiction is always the goal, the specialized needs of the child or lack of community resources may render that goal unattainable. The most common reasons why a child is placed outside of his or her home jurisdiction include:

- Proximity to parents'/guardians' home (family lives closer to placement in adjacent jurisdiction than alternative placement at far end of same jurisdiction);
- Only available and appropriate placement with needed services/milieu (per individual service plan);
- Only available and appropriate placement with needed services/milieu (per court order);
- Child's request for particular placement;
- Child needed to be removed from community for safety reasons (*e.g.*, gang involvement);
- Only available placement while waiting for more appropriate placement; and
- Only available placement while waiting for placement closer to home.

It is recognized throughout this report that, when a placement is not available in the home jurisdiction, the second-best option is to place a child in an adjacent jurisdiction. Many jurisdictions do not have sufficient need to warrant the development of all placement types within jurisdictional boundaries. In such instances, it is expected that children are placed in an adjacent jurisdiction or one within the home region. Tables illustrating jurisdictions of residence and jurisdictions of placement for children in the placement categories as well as for Agency-specific placements within those categories are provided and will be referenced throughout this report. This data is available for only the FY10 one-day census.

## ***Section II: Statewide Summary & Highlights***

### **Overview**

Data reported and discussed in this section of The Report represent two sources: a one-day census in Maryland, conducted on January 31<sup>st</sup> of each fiscal year of all children in out-of-home placements made or funded by Maryland Agencies or Administrations, and data on demographics, cost, and rate of entry for each fiscal year.

Information on each child was gathered by the placing or funding Agency/Agencies and submitted to GOC for inclusion in this report. The Report provides information on the number of placements in particular categories of out-of-home placements and analyzes them within the context of the children's home jurisdiction, the jurisdiction in which they are placed, and the placement or funding Agency/Agencies.

This section provides a summary of the Statewide data and highlight key findings.

### **Out-of-Home Placement (OOHP) Summary Data: State of Maryland**

#### **All Out-of-Home Placements by All Agencies**

Table 1 (page 15) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of OOH placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction that are also placed in that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.


# *All Out-of-Home Placements: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction*

All OOHP Categories, All Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	129	1.3%	97	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	14	5
Anne Arundel	287	2.8%	3	153	43	16	2	5	1	6	12	3	7	0	0	2	0	4	7	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	13	4
Baltimore	784	7.7%	1	14	426	167	0	4	20	8	1	2	8	4	33	26	0	11	14	0	1	0	0	9	1	0	25	9
Baltimore City	5356	52.4%	7	153	1036	3243	0	3	36	14	29	8	10	1	124	88	1	19	194	0	13	2	0	16	5	1	119	234
Calvert	91	0.9%	0	3	4	3	54	2	0	0	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	4	1
Caroline	53	0.5%	2	0	3	3	0	30	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0
Carroll	84	0.8%	4	0	8	5	0	0	47	1	0	0	9	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	2	0
Cecil	162	1.6%	3	5	18	6	0	1	0	91	1	2	3	0	10	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	9	2
Charles	153	1.5%	1	1	11	5	1	0	0	0	101	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	16	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	1
Dorchester	38	0.4%	1	0	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4	0
Frederick	234	2.3%	7	0	18	6	0	2	3	1	0	1	135	0	0	2	0	8	7	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	9	1
Garrett	60	0.6%	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1
Harford	320	3.1%	1	4	50	32	1	7	1	19	0	1	10	2	163	6	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	16	0
Howard	103	1.0%	1	3	24	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	1	45	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
Kent	29	0.3%	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Montgomery	777	7.6%	6	6	54	39	2	6	7	4	3	1	27	5	3	13	0	491	57	0	1	0	0	23	0	0	25	4
Prince George's	825	8.1%	1	13	57	31	6	3	2	3	26	2	4	0	1	7	1	48	562	0	0	5	0	1	1	0	40	11
Queen Anne's	34	0.3%	3	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Somerset	60	0.6%	3	0	7	2	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	2	1	15	2	1	1
St. Mary's	127	1.2%	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	3	18	0	0	1	5	1	0	3	17	0	0	53	0	0	1	0	5	5
Talbot	33	0.3%	2	0	4	3	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	7	0	6	0	0	2
Washington	247	2.4%	3	1	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	182	1	0	10	2
Wicomico	117	1.1%	1	1	10	7	0	2	0	1	0	6	3	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	68	2	4	2
Worcester	61	0.6%	1	1	2	5	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	9	30	1	1
OOS	42	0.4%	0	5	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	8	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
Unknown	7	0.1%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total	10213	100.0%	151	366	1805	3612	71	77	122	151	203	65	249	73	352	196	25	600	894	32	44	69	13	285	123	35	313	287
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			75.2%	53.3%	54.3%	60.5%	59.3%	56.6%	56.0%	56.2%	66.0%	42.1%	57.7%	73.3%	50.9%	43.7%	48.3%	63.2%	68.1%	55.9%	33.3%	41.7%	21.2%	73.7%	58.1%	49.2%	0.0%	14.3%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			1.5%	3.6%	17.7%	35.4%	0.7%	0.8%	1.2%	1.5%	2.0%	0.6%	2.4%	0.7%	3.4%	1.9%	0.2%	5.9%	8.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	2.8%	1.2%	0.3%	3.1%	2.8%

Table 1: All Out-of-Home Placements on January 31, 2010

## Overall Number of OOHP

There were 10,213 reported OOH placements on January 31, 2010, the date chosen for the one-day count. Of those placements, 8,515 were placed by DHR; 933 were placed by DJS; 286 were funded by MSDE; 69 were placed by MHA; 279 were placed by ADAA; and 131 were placed by DDA (see Figure 1 below).



**Figure 1: Percentage of Placements, January 31, 2010, by Placing and/or Funding Agency**

### *Placement Type and Category Summary*

As is illustrated in Figure 2, page 17, the majority of children in OOH placement were in Family Home Settings. As is to be expected, as the placement category becomes more restrictive and less community-based, the number of children requiring that placement category declines. While there is a commitment in Maryland to a full continuum of services within a system of care, there must also be an economy of scale, with the most restrictive and less frequently utilized placements being available regionally or Statewide, rather than an expectation that all services will be available on a jurisdictional basis. Figure 3, page 17 shows that the trends over time are declining which indicates a reduction in OOH placements.

## Placement Categories: January 31, 2010




Figure 2: Placement Categories on January 31, 2010




Figure 3: All OOHP Trends by Placement Category

## Out-of-State (OOS) Placements

Of the 10,213 reported placements that were known to be from Maryland jurisdictions, 313 or 3.1% were in an OOS placement on January 31, 2010 based on the one-day census count (see Table 1, page 15).

The State Coordinating Council for Residential Placement of Disabled Children (SCC) and the Local Coordinating Councils (LCCs) were established in the 1980's as a response to the State's long-standing concern for children placed in residential treatment. The SCC is comprised of Cabinet-level Secretaries of Maryland's child-serving agencies or their designees. The LCCs include local representatives from each of the child-serving agencies and may also include a

parent from the community and a member of a local parent-advocacy group. The goals of the SCC and LCCs are to:

- combine the resources of various agencies to improve services to these children;
- foster the development of resources necessary to serve children with special needs in Maryland;
- promote interagency coordination in the provision of services;
- ensure State funds for residential placement of children with special needs are allocated in accordance with Human Services Article §8-401-409 (previously Article 49D) (Annotated Code of Maryland), House Bill 1386 (2003 Session), and other relevant State and federal laws;
- develop interagency plans-of-care for children to assure placement in the least restrictive environment appropriate; and
- recommend and facilitate the development of new and enhanced community-based programs to serve children with disabilities who might otherwise remain in restrictive placements that are geographically distant from their families and communities.

The SCC is required by law (Maryland Human Services Articles 8-401 to 8-409) to review applications for State funding for out of State (OOS) placements. COMAR 14.31.01 defines OOS placements as alternative living units, group homes, hospitals, residential facilities for children with disabilities, RTCs, wilderness programs, and other residential settings (not foster care). The SCC also provides training, technical assistance, and oversight to the LCCs. GOC assists the SCC in monitoring of the LCCs.

#### *SCC Data on OOS Placements*

Table 2, page 19, illustrates the number of children reviewed by the SCC for OOS placement by program. The reader should be aware that the number reviewed is not the actual number of children who were placed OOS.

Facility	FY08	FY09	FY10
Abraxas Ohio	10	8	2
Abraxas Pa	4	11	14
Advoserve	15	9 (2 in FL)	10
Bancroft	0	1	0
Bennington	6	4	3
Boys Town	0	0	1
Canyon State	4	9	21
Capital Academy	0	1	1
Clarinda	23	12	22
Concern	3	2	0
Cottonwood	0	0	2
Cumberland	1	3	0
Devereux Fl	4	3	0
Devereux Ga	13	5	1
Devereux Pa	0	0	3
Finr	3	1	0
Fl Chamberlain	1	1	1
Glen Mills	9	19	11
Grafton	3	3	0
High Frontier	1	0	0
Jasper Mountain	2	0	0
Latham	1	0	0
Laurel Heights	0	2	0
Lakeview	0	2	0
Kids Peace	1	0	0
Mcdowell	3	0	0
Melmark	1	0	0
Mid Atlantic	27	13	16
Natchez Trace	9	11	2
National Childrens Center	1	0	0
National Deaf Academy	0	1	0
New Hope	4	2	1
North Springs	2	0	1
Pa Clinicals	1	4	2
Palmetto	0	0	1
Peninsula Village	0	1	0
Sandhill	0	1	0
San Marcos	0	1	0
Skills Of Central Pa	0	1	0
Southern Peaks	4	1	0
Southwest Indiana	4	1	1
Stetson	0	0	1
Summit	7	2	8
The Pines	12	7	5
Turning Point	0	7	2
Walden	0	0	1
Whitney	0	1	0
Wings For Life	1	1	0
Woods	3	1	0
Woodward	12	6	8
Children Services	1	0	0
Subtotal	196	159	141
Children With Multiple Reviews	6	3	0
Total # Of New Children Reviewed	202	162	141

**Table 2: SSC OOS Placement Reviews by Program**

## Demographic Summary: Gender, Age, and Race

### Gender

The majority of children in care on January 31, 2010 were male (55.7%). When reporting the gender of children in care, DHR had the most equivalent proportion of males and females in placement. However, all Agencies have more males than females in placement. Table 3 below reports the number of children in care on January 31, 2010 by Agency and gender.

<i>Gender of Placements, by Agency</i>							
	ADAA	DDA	DHR	DJS	MHA	MSDE	ALL AGENCIES
Male	207	83	4,388	795	40	176	5,689 (55.7%)
Female	72	48	4,127	138	28	110	4,523 (44.3%)
Unknown	---	---	---	---	1	---	1 (0%)

**Table 3: All Agencies: Gender of Placements on January 31, 2010**

As indicated by Table 4 below, the reported number of males in placement on January 31, 2008 has decreased by 10.7% (680) on January 31, 2010. There has also been an 8.8% (436) decrease for female placements during the same time frame.

<i>Trends by Gender of Placements, by Agency</i>			
	1/31/08	1/31/09	1/31/10
Male	6,369 (56.2%)	6,053 (56.3%)	5,689 (55.7%)
Female	4,959 (43.8%)	4,704 (43.7%)	4,523 (44.3%)
Unknown	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)
Totals	11,329	10,757	

**Table 4: All Agencies: Gender of Placements trends for One Day Census**

### Age

Figure 4, page 21, provides a breakdown and comparison of placements by age as reported in the one day census for 2008, 2009 and 2010. Age is a new criterion that was examined for placements reported in the one-day census. Age has been added to the analysis because it is an important demographic criterion to consider when discussing resources for children and children in out-of-home placements. In future reports, this will be examined in greater detail in order to assess the trends related to age.



On January 31, 2010, 45.6% of the placements were children ages 16-22; 23.3% were ages 11-15; 19.1% were ages 0-5; and 12% were ages 6-10 (Figure 4).





Figure 4: OOHP Placements by age

## Race

Table 5 below provides a breakdown of placements by race and placing Agency. In examining the race of children in OOH placements on January 31, 2010, 68.9% were African American and 24.0% were White. This trend has remained consistent over the last three years (Figure 5, page 22).


<i><b>Race</b></i>	<i><b>TOTAL</b></i>	<i><b>ADAA</b></i>	<i><b>DDA</b></i>	<i><b>DJS</b></i>	<i><b>DHR</b></i>	<i><b>MHA</b></i>	<i><b>MSDE</b></i>
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	10 (0.1%)	1	0	2	7	0	0
Asian	37 (0.4%)	2	1	2	23	0	9
Black or African American	7,038 (68.9%)	86	36	672	6,085	38	121
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	5 (0.0%)	0	0	0	5	0	0
White	2,452 (24.0%)	182	38	215	1,843	26	148
Bi-racial/Multiple Races Identified	310 (3.0%)	0	0	1	309	0	0
Other	242 (2.4%)	8	49	35	137	5	8
Unknown	119 (1.2%)	0	7	6	106	0	0
Total	10,213	279	131	933	8,515	69	286

Table 5: All Agencies: Race of Children in Care



**Figure 5: Race Trends of Children in Care**

## Overall Costs associated with OOHP



**Figure 6: OOH Placement Costs**

	<b>FY08</b>	<b>FY09</b>	<b>FY10</b>
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>Total Costs</b>
<b>ADAA<sup>3</sup></b>	\$3,042,333	\$1,495,208	\$5,189,089
<b>DDA</b>	\$7,598,552	\$5,961,393	\$5,286,810
<b>DHR</b>	\$376,742,596	\$374,567,492	\$348,579,469
<b>DJS<sup>4</sup></b>	\$73,931,645	\$76,742,007	\$74,019,693
<b>MHA<sup>5</sup></b>	\$91,115,506	\$80,173,806	\$15,228,053
<b>MSDE</b>	\$18,710,308	\$19,536,225	\$21,499,723
<b>MD School for Blind</b>	\$14,948,480	\$14,607,450	\$14,933,292
<b>MD School for Deaf</b>	\$5,562,242	\$8,266,833	\$8,189,818
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$591,651,662</b>	<b>\$581,350,414</b>	<b>\$492,925,947</b>

**Table 6: Total Costs for of OOHP by Agency**

### ***Key Cost Findings***

- DDA has reduced total placement costs by 30%, from approximately \$7.6 million in FY08 to \$5.3 million in FY10. DDA has been working diligently to serve children in their family homes, with the result that fewer children are going into care. As those in care age out of the child system into the adult system, the numbers have gone down.
- DHR has also significantly reduced cost for out-of-home placements over the past three fiscal years: overall costs, which include placement, education, and administrative costs, have decreased by 7.5%. Among those, placement costs have fallen 13%, from approximately \$290 million in FY08 to just over \$250 million in FY10. This is attributable to the considerable reduction in both the number of out-of-home placements and the proportion of placements in group homes. Administrative costs have increased

<sup>3</sup> ADAA FY08 & FY09 Placement and Cost Information come from the FY09 Out-of-Home Placement & Family Preservation Resource Plan. The FY09 ADAA costs only include what was paid by Medicaid. A comparison across years would not be valid.

<sup>4</sup> DJS cost figures include only committed residential out of home placements and exclude secure detention, pending placement and shelter care costs.

<sup>5</sup> MHA FY08 & FY09 Placement and Cost Information come from the FY09 Out-of-Home Placement & Family Preservation Resource Plan. The FY08 & FY09 information includes Private and Public RTCs. FY10 is public RTCs only. MHA is currently in the process analyzing data on the cost and utilization of private sector Residential Treatment Care (RTC) beds for FY10. A detailed analysis of the cost trends from FY08 to FY10 will be included in an addendum to this report once the data has been validated and analysis completed.

by 4.3% from FY08 to FY10. Education costs for children in foster care, however, have increased substantially, by 255% from FY08 (\$2.6 million) to FY10 (\$9.1 million) (see table 30, page 50).

- Between FY09 and FY10, DJS's education cost for children has increased by 14%, \$7,032,391 to \$8,042,921. The residential cost increased only by 3%, \$39,130,646 in FY09 to \$40,201,070 in FY10. Between FY09 and FY10, the State operated placement cost was reduced by 16% (\$30,578,970 in FY09 to \$25,775,702 in FY 10). This is primarily attributable to the closing of Thomas J.S. Waxter Center and Cheltenham Redirect Impact Program in FY10.
- MSDE's overall placement costs increased by 11.5%.

## **Rate of Entry by Jurisdiction for OOHP**

### **Data Source & Considerations**

For reporting rate of entry, the rates are per 1,000 children under age 18 based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census estimates for each year.

The population denominator used in determining the rate of entry is the population of children Birth to 18 for each individual jurisdiction. However, the Departments of Juvenile Services, Human Resources, and Education include some children ages 19-21 in their placement data, as required by the mandates of their Agencies.

Data used in the calculation of the rate of entry is provided by each placing/funding Agency. As some children experience multiple out-of-home placements in a year by different State Agencies, and some children are co-committed or co-funded among Agencies, there may be duplicative counts.

The State continues to make efforts to treat children in their homes, and, when an out-of-home placement is necessary, to place children as close to home as possible. DHR's Place Matters initiative supports maintaining children in their home through intensive in-home services, and in instances when children cannot safely remain at home, placing children in their home jurisdictions whenever possible.

Unfortunately, one unintended consequence of providing in-home services to children in lieu of out-of-home placements is that those children remaining in out-of-home care are often the children with the most severe and intense needs. These children may have severe mental health and/or substance abuse disorders, may have experienced severe abuse or neglect, and/or may have committed serious criminal offenses. Accordingly, as the number of children in out-of-home placement decreases, the level of services required by the children remaining in out-of-home may increase.

Jurisdiction	Rate of Entry FY08	Rate of Entry FY09	Rate of Entry FY10	Two Year Change	Average Change	One Year Change
Allegany	34.4	35.0	31.0	-10%	-5%	-11%
Anne Arundel	5.8	5.9	6.2	8%	4%	5%
Baltimore	6.1	6.2	5.9	-4%	-2%	-4%
Baltimore City	37.4	42.5	42.6	14%	7%	0%
Calvert	4.8	4.5	5.7	19%	9%	25%
Caroline	9.9	9.0	7.8	-21%	-10%	-13%
Carroll	4.4	4.2	4.7	7%	4%	12%
Cecil	9.4	8.9	9.7	3%	1%	8%
Charles	5.0	6.1	6.4	27%	13%	4%
Dorchester	22.5	29.3	33.5	49%	25%	14%
Frederick	7.0	5.9	8.8	26%	13%	49%
Garrett	15.7	17.0	20.1	28%	14%	18%
Harford	8.5	7.9	6.7	-21%	-10%	-15%
Howard	2.2	2.4	1.9	-13%	-6%	-19%
Kent	22.7	28.2	29.7	31%	16%	5%
Montgomery	5.0	5.5	4.7	-6%	-3%	-16%
Prince George's	4.2	4.7	5.2	23%	12%	12%
Queen Anne's	4.2	6.2	4.3	2%	1%	-31%
Somerset	14.2	11.3	12.0	-16%	-8%	6%
St. Mary's	8.3	9.1	10.7	28%	14%	18%
Talbot	9.4	5.3	7.3	-22%	-11%	38%
Washington	15.1	13.8	13.0	-14%	-7%	-5%
Wicomico	10.8	8.5	7.8	-28%	-14%	-8%
Worcester	13.4	15.2	15.7	17%	9%	3%
Total:	10.2	10.8	10.8	5%	3%	-1%

**Table 7: Rate of Entry for OOHP**

## Agency Overviews

92.5% of the total population of children in OOHP during FY10 were placed by The Departments of Human Resources and Juvenile Services. In an effort to meet the needs of the children they serve, both Agencies have developed an OOHP overview reporting the overall trends in placement and costs as well as highlights of the key initiatives associated with OOHP.

## DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR) OVERVIEW

### Reduction in Out-of-Home Population

**The total DHR out-of-of-home population has decreased 12% since the end of FY08** (Table 8). This reduction is a result of DHR's Place Matters and Family Family-Centered Practice initiatives, designed to maintain children at home whenever possible and return children from OOH care as quickly and safely as possible. These strategies have resulted in **the lowest DHR out-of-home population since the end of FY 1993** (*State Report on Out-of-home placements and Family Preservation - 2002*, Governor's Office of Children, Youth, and Families, 12/3/2002).

<i>Placement Population Flow – All Placements (count of placements, not children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
FY08	10081	10857	11465	9473
FY09	9473	11423	11989	8907
FY10	8907	11193	11747	8353
Change from FY08	-12%	3%	2%	-12%
Average Yearly Change	-6%	2%	1%	-6%
Recent Year Change	-6%	-2%	-2%	-6%

**Table 8: DHR Placement Population Flow**

Table 8 shows data on the number of actual placements among all children in DHR care. It should be noted that children are duplicated in this count, as any one child may have more than one placement in any fiscal year and in any episode of DHR out-of-home care ("removal episode"). These placements are largely dictated by court decisions regarding CINA petitions, reunifications, and adoptions. The actual number of children entering DHR out of home care, however, is much lower than the number of placement "entries" as each new placement/placement change for a child is considered a new placement "entry." The actual numbers of children entering DHR out of home care are 3,198 in FY08, 2,925 in FY09, and 3,122 in FY10 (source – State Stat; these numbers may include duplication of some children who may have entered DHR out -of -home care more than once).

During any one child's removal episode, a child may experience several placements. These placements include events such as foster care placements, group home placements, short-term hospitalizations for a medical injury/illness (or psychiatric illness), trial home visits with parents or relatives, and /or placements at an on-campus college dorm. An older child in DHR care who for these reasons lives in his/her own apartment is still considered to be in a 'placement.' Caution must be taken when interpreting the number of *placements* overseen by DHR or experienced by a child. Not all placements are unique to children in foster care, such as the hospitalization for medical conditions, placements with relatives, college dorm or 'own apartment' living situations, and/or job training programs. The recent 12% reduction in the DHR

out-of-home population represents significant progress in improving outcomes for children and families.

### **Increase in Use of Family Foster Homes**

In addition to reducing the overall out-of-home population, DHR has focused on ensuring that children are in the most appropriate and least restrictive placements possible. The preference is for placing and maintaining children in family foster homes whenever possible, until they are able to return home or find permanency. Since FY08, DHR has increased the percentage of children in family foster homes at the beginning of the fiscal year from 69.5% in FY08 to over 75% in FY10 (Table 9, page 28), and entries into family foster homes have increased from 62% in FY08 to over 70% in FY10.

### **Reduction in Placement Costs**

In addition to the considerable reduction in the number of children in OOH care, DHR has also significantly reduced cost for OOH placements over the past three fiscal years. **Total placement costs have fallen 13%, from approximately \$290 million in FY08 to just over \$250 million in FY10** (Table 10, page 29). **This is the first time in 20 years of data collection that costs have decreased.**

Tables 10 and 11, page 29, show placement, education, and administrative costs for FY08-FY10, as well as a breakdown of costs for FY10 by placement category. Table 10, page 29, shows the three-year history of total costs for DHR out-of-home placements and the 13% decrease in placement costs discussed previously. There was an increase in education and administrative costs. Table 11, page 29, shows total costs as well as costs for family home placements and community-based residential placements for FY10.

Administrative costs are unable to be broken down by placement category. At this time, no suitable methodology has been identified for measuring the time a caseworker spends per child for each placement category or for isolating separate administrative costs by the placement category. Measuring administrative costs would require a complex and costly study of caseworker and administration time based on the types of placements experienced by children in the worker's caseload and would be complicated by several of the following factors:

- children do not remain in one placement setting or category throughout their time in DHR out of of-home care; as their placement needs change, their placements and/or placement categories change;
- a caseworker often carries the caseload of an entire family, regardless of the different placement categories of the individual children in the sibling group; and
- some children are placed via and by child placing agencies, private residential child care centers, etc., which provide some of the basic services (such as transportation, coordination of appointments, etc.) that a caseworker would do for children in public placements.

<i>DHR Population Flow, Placements, FYs 08 - 10</i>							
	<b>FY</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Community- Based</b>	<b>Family Home Settings</b>	<b>Hospitalization</b>	<b>Non- Community Based</b>	<b>Placement Category Not Available</b>
<i>DHR Placements (children) at beginning of FY</i>							
<b>Numbers</b>	<b>FY08</b>	10081	1550	7006	34	230	1261
	<b>FY09</b>	9473	1539	6868	19	309	738
	<b>FY10</b>	8907	1388	6740	31	350	398
<b>Percentage of Total Placements</b>	<b>FY08</b>	100.00%	15.38%	69.50%	0.34%	2.28%	12.51%
	<b>FY09</b>	100.00%	16.25%	72.50%	0.20%	3.26%	7.79%
	<b>FY10</b>	100.00%	15.58%	75.67%	0.35%	3.93%	4.47%
<i>DHR Entries during FY (count of placements, not children)</i>							
<b>Numbers</b>	<b>FY08</b>	10857	2450	6740	223	326	1118
	<b>FY09</b>	11423	2405	7606	223	397	792
	<b>FY10</b>	11193	2087	7900	193	422	591
<b>Percentage of Total Placements</b>	<b>FY08</b>	100.00%	22.57%	62.08%	2.05%	3.00%	10.30%
	<b>FY09</b>	100.00%	21.05%	66.58%	1.95%	3.48%	6.93%
	<b>FY10</b>	100.00%	18.65%	70.58%	1.72%	3.77%	5.28%
<i>DHR Exits during FY (count of placements, not children)</i>							
<b>Numbers</b>	<b>FY08</b>	11465	2461	6878	238	247	1641
	<b>FY09</b>	11989	2556	7734	211	356	1132
	<b>FY10</b>	11747	2270	8473	201	471	332
<b>Percentage of Total Placements</b>	<b>FY08</b>	100.00%	21.47%	59.99%	2.08%	2.15%	14.31%
	<b>FY09</b>	100.00%	21.32%	64.51%	1.76%	2.97%	9.44%
	<b>FY10</b>	100.00%	19.32%	72.13%	1.71%	4.01%	2.83%
<i>DHR Placements (children) at end of FY</i>							
<b>Numbers</b>	<b>FY08</b>	9473	1539	6868	19	309	738
	<b>FY09</b>	8907	1388	6740	31	350	398
	<b>FY10</b>	8353	1205	6167	23	301	657
<b>Percentage of Total Placements</b>	<b>FY08</b>	100.00%	16.25%	72.50%	0.20%	3.26%	7.79%
	<b>FY09</b>	100.00%	15.58%	75.67%	0.35%	3.93%	4.47%
	<b>FY10</b>	100.00%	14.43%	73.83%	0.28%	3.60%	7.87%

**Table 9: DHR Population Flow, Placements, FY08–FY10**



<b>All DHR Out of Home Placement Payments, FY08-FY10<sup>6</sup></b>			
<b>FY</b>	<b>Placement Costs</b>	<b>Educational Cost</b>	<b>Administrative Costs</b>
FY08	\$289,118,007	\$ 2,572,407	\$ 85,052,182
FY09	\$281,985,067	\$ 5,624,745	\$ 86,957,680
FY10	\$250,702,227	\$ 9,134,127	\$ 88,743,115
Change from FY08	-13%	255%	4%
Avg. Yearly Change	-7%	88%	2%
Recent Year Change	-11%	62%	2%

**Table 10: All DHR Out of Home Placement Payments, FY08-FY10**

<b>DHR FY10 Costs by Placement Category</b>				
<b>Categories</b>	<b>Number of Beds Days Funded in FY10</b>	<b>Placement Costs FY10</b>	<b>Educational Cost FY10</b>	<b>Administrative Costs FY10</b>
All placement payments <sup>7</sup>	Not Applicable	\$250,702,227	\$9,134,127	\$88,743,115
Family Home Settings <sup>8</sup>	1,736,358	\$128,423,998	\$1,994,235	Not Available
Community-Based Residential Placement <sup>9</sup>	485,909	\$105,271,600	\$4,795,893	Not Available
Non- Community-Based Residential Placement <sup>10</sup>	2593	\$518,860	\$19,961	Not Available
Payments outside of MD CHESSIE or FY10 <sup>11</sup>	Not Available	\$16,487,769	\$2,324,038	Not Available

**Table 11: DHR FY10 Costs by Placement Category**

<sup>6 and 7</sup> The business practice for deriving these costs, which has been used over the last 20 years, is the reporting of cash payments for foster care placements during the Fiscal Year period, regardless of the foster care service period. These costs reflect DHR payments during the fiscal year, even if some payments were adjustments or late payments for services rendered in the previous fiscal year.

<sup>8, 9 and 10</sup> Placements costs for family home and community-based placements reflect actual costs for services provided during FY10, regardless of when payment was made to provider.

<sup>11</sup> Some costs for placement and education during FY10, the first full fiscal year since DHR went live with MD CHESSIE maintenance payments, were paid outside of MD CHESSIE, allowed on a strict basis involving LDSS Director and DHR Fiscal approvals. Consequently, these payments are not available from MD CHESSIE and a breakdown of costs by placement category (Family Home/Community-Based Placement) is not available. DHR has implemented several strategies to minimize the payments made outside of MD CHESSIE, so that future fiscal year data can be collected from MD CHESSIE and analyzed by placement category.

## Age of Children in DHR Out-of-Home Care

<i>January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in DHR Out -of - Home Care</i>		
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Number in Care</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
less than 1	305	3.58%
1 - 5	1647	19.34%
6 - 10	1217	14.29%
11 - 15	1991	23.38%
16 - 20	3355	39.40%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8515</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 12: Age Groups of Children in DHR Out of Home Care on January 31, 2010**

DHR is committed to finding permanent homes for all children. However, for children who do not have a permanent home or family at age 18, DHR encourages remaining in DHR care until the age of 21 to allow those children access to the support and resources necessary during these transitional years. As a result of this policy, the largest age group of children in DHR out-of-home care are children ages 16 to 20, at nearly 40%. Nearly 24% of children in out-of-home care are ages 11 to 15, and the next largest group is younger children ages 1 to 5, at 19%. Children ages 6 to 10 represent approximately 14% of all children in out-of-home care and infants represent nearly 4% (Table 12).

## Data Quality Issues

As discussed above, implementation of The Maryland Children's Electronic Social Services Information Exchange (MD CHESSIE) as the source for placement payments was a significant milestone in the development and refinement of MD CHESSIE. Data entry and quality rates have improved, and, consequently, data completion is improving. As FY08 was a transition year between the previous legacy data system and MD CHESSIE, some records are incomplete and/or were not entered. The data from FY08, therefore, must be interpreted with caution. Information on data which was unavailable in MD CHESSIE over the past three years is presented below. Significant improvement has been noted in the percentages of data unavailable for placements at the beginning of the fiscal year (68%), new placements (47%), and exits (80%). (Table 13, page 31)

It is important to note that although data on some records may not be available in MD CHESSIE, this information is maintained in and accessible through hard-copy files at each LDSS.

Since MD CHESSIE, does not currently track co-lead Agencies in a reportable format the numbers reported as children with co-lead agencies should be interpreted as an underestimation of the actual number. Consequently, the numbers reported in this report of children with

involvement in other agencies are considered a significant under-estimation of the true number of children with co-lead Agencies. Accordingly this data should not be used for analysis.

<b><i>Population Flow – Placement Category Not Available in MD CHESSIE (count of placements, not children)</i></b>				
<b>State Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Placements at Start of FY</b>	<b>Starts in FY</b>	<b>Ends in FY</b>	<b>Placements at End of FY</b>
FY08	1261	1118	1641	738
FY09	738	792	1132	398
FY10	398	591	332	657
Change from FY08	-68%	-47%	-80%	-11%
Average Yearly Change	-44%	-27%	-55%	-6%
Recent Year Change	-46%	-25%	-71%	65%

**Table 13: DHR Population Flow – Placement Category**

Finally, the out-of-home population data presented in this report comes entirely from MD CHESSIE. Other data published by DHR, such as State Stat reports, utilize LDSS raw data, which may differ slightly from data extracted from MD CHESSIE. This is attributable to data entry issues at the local level. State Stat and Place Matters indicators also utilize a different methodology and includes an indicator focusing on children in group home placements which differs from this report’s focus community community-based placements: “community-based placements” include group homes but also independent living programs, college, alternative living units – none of which are included in DHR Place Matter’s definition/indicator for group home placements. Other reports published by the federal Children’s Bureau utilize MD CHESSIE as the sole data source but may use different methods for analysis. Variances in data extraction dates, timeframes presented, and analysis methodology between these various sources and publications result in minor differences in the aggregate data, but are considered acceptable margins of error.

## ***Resource Development***

### **Department Initiatives**

#### *Place Matters*

DHR made a deliberate and focused shift in its practice, policy and service delivery with the July 2007 Statewide rollout of the Place Matters initiative which promotes safety, family strengthening, and permanency and community-based services for children and families in the child welfare system. The proactive direction of Place Matters, designed to improve the continuum of services for Maryland’s children and families, places emphasis on preventing children from coming into care when possible, ensuring that children are appropriately placed when they enter care, and shortening the length of time children remain in out-of-home care.

Place Matters is in alignment with the outcomes of the Child and Family Services Review around safety, permanency and well-being. The goals of the Place Matters Initiative are to:

- Keep children in families first – Place more children who enter care with relatives or in resource families as appropriate and decrease the numbers of children in congregate care;
- Maintain children in their communities – Keep children at home with their families and offer more services in their communities, across all levels of care;
- Reduce reliance on out of home care – Provide more in-home supports to help maintain children in their families;
- Minimize the length of stay – Reduce length of stay in out-of-home care and increase reunification; and
- Manage with data and redirect resources – Ensure that managers have relevant data to improve decision-making, oversight, and accountability. Shift resources from the back-end to the front-end of services.

The development of a practice model is a large component of Place Matters. Maryland's child welfare practice model is based on the principles of Family Centered Practice (FCP), which focus on strategies to involve fathers, paternal kin and incarcerated parents. FCP helps with ensuring children maintain supportive families and community relationship connections. Outreach is expanded to increase opportunities for families and community members to be involved at the administrative decision making level in addition to the case planning level. FCP assures that the entire child welfare system engages the family in helping them improve their ability to adequately plan and care for the safety and well-being of their children. In the process, the State is strengthening community partnerships and resources available for our families and gathering information to improve the quality of services offered through the child welfare continuum.

DHR is also in the process of developing and implementing a Child Engagement Model which will be the framework of how Maryland includes children in the entire child welfare process, including transitional planning. In order for the Child engagement model to be effective it will be developed and implemented with the assistance and support of stakeholders, which includes children, providers, foster parents, staff and the courts. As part of its strategy, Maryland has contracted with the Maryland Foster Children Resource Center (MFYRC). MFYRC is an organization of former foster children whose vision is to provide a variety of supportive resources for both children in care and alumni of the foster care system. MFYRC is charged with the development of a Resource Directory, which will be a resource tool that children will utilize to access services and programs to address their needs.

## **Gaps and Needs**

In Maryland, older children ages 14-21 represent over 50% of the children in foster care. Though reunification, adoption and exiting to guardianship are options, it is difficult for this cohort of children to achieve these permanency outcomes. The needs of these children vary and include access to available resources and services post exiting foster care, linkages with caring adults to establish a life-long connection or establishing a rapport with their child welfare worker to develop an effective transitional plan.

One of the challenges Maryland has faced is building specific array of community based services for children needing mental health services. As a means to address this need, Maryland has implemented Care Coordination using High Fidelity Wraparound through Care Management Entities (CME). Wraparound is a service delivery model that uses a Child and Family Team, comprised of care coordinators, family members, natural supports, children, and professionals, to create an integrated, strengths-based, needs-driven plan of care. It strongly emphasizes family voice and choice, as measured by the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System as well as the other tenets of Wraparound and Systems of Care.

Maryland has identified the need for improving the areas of maintaining connections to extended family and community, involving parents in activities, therapy, etc., and routinely involving parents in case planning, especially fathers.

## **Highlights**

- The total DHR out-of-home population has decreased 12% since the end of FY08 (8,353 children in OOH placement at the end of FY10) – this is the lowest DHR out-of-home population since the end of FY93.
- Since FY08, DHR has increased the percentage of children in family foster homes at the beginning of the fiscal year from 69.5% in FY08 to over 75% in FY10, and entries into family foster homes have increased from 62% in FY08 to over 70% in FY10.
- In the past three fiscal years, there has been a 22% decrease in the number of children placed in DHR community-based residential placements (end of fiscal year count).

## DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS) OVERVIEW

In FY10, the total number of DJS out-of-home placements decreased by 4% from 2,161 in FY08 to 2,079 in FY10 (Table 14). Table 15 shows the child count percentage decline was also 4% between FY08 (1,700 children) and FY10 (1,636 children). The reason for this decline can be credited to the Maryland Model for Juvenile Services that was initiated in FY08. The Maryland Model is a regionalized service delivery model focusing on evidence-based programs (EBP) and community collaboration. The Maryland Model also stresses the importance of validated assessment and treatment tools (with built-in ongoing quality improvement), treatment, and successful reentry services for children requiring residential care.

<i>Placement Population Flow – All Placements (count of placements, not Children) Start and end FY Children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
FY08	950	2161	2130	977
FY09	977	2119	2196	895
FY10	895	2079	2075	889
Change from FY08	-6%	-4%	-3%	-9%
Average Yearly Change	-3%	-2%	-1%	-5%
Recent Year Change	-8%	-2%	-6%	-1%

Table 14: DJS Placement Population Flow

<i>Children Population Flow – All Children (Children count, not placements)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Child Entries into DJS OOH Care)	Ends in FY (Child Exits from DJS OOH Care)	Placements at End of FY
FY08	950	1700	1673	977
FY09	977	1619	1701	895
FY10	895	1636	1642	889
Change from FY08	-6%	-4%	-2%	-9%
Average Yearly Change	-3%	-2%	-1%	-5%
Recent Year Change	-8%	1%	-3%	-1%

Table 15: DJS Children Population Flow

Tables 14 and 15 show the differences between data counts of placements and children entering or exiting DJS out-of-home care. It is possible for children to have more than one placement admission or release due to transfer to another placement or a new charge resulting in a placement. Table 14 shows the number of all placements and exits of DJS out-of-home population for each FY. It is a duplicated count including each program entry/exit episodes. Table 15 counts each child once regardless of any multiple admissions or release counts. Therefore, the multiple placement counts given in Table 14 will be higher than those in Table 15.

The placements at start of FY and placements at end of FY numbers are one day child counts and are the same in both tables.

For the purpose of tracking OOH placements, the Children's Cabinet classified all OOH placements into four macro placements categories. They are: family Home Settings, community based residential placement, Non-community based residential placement and hospitalization.

### **Three-Year Trend by Placement Category**

Table 16 below provides the number of children at the start of each FY, new placements during the FY (duplicated admissions), exits during the FY (duplicated releases) and end of FY (children count) by each placement category. Over the past three years, DJS has reduced its community based population from 32% at the start of the FY08 to 24% at the end of FY10. On the other hand, non-community based placements have increased from 58% at the start of FY08 to 65% at the end of FY10.

<i>DJS Population Flow, Placements, FYs 08 - 10</i>							
	FY	Total	Family Home Settings	Community-Based	Non-Community Based	Hospitalization	Placement Category Not Available
<i>DJS Placements (Children) at beginning of FY</i>							
Numbers	FY08	950	79	305	554	12	0
	FY09	977	82	304	579	12	0
	FY10	895	82	272	532	9	0
Percentage of Total Placements	FY08	100%	8%	32%	58%	1%	0%
	FY09	100%	8%	31%	59%	1%	0%
	FY10	100%	9%	30%	59%	1%	0%
<i>DJS Entries during FY (count of placements, not Children)</i>							
Numbers	FY08	2161	143	599	1356	63	0
	FY09	2119	128	595	1336	60	0
	FY10	2079	128	509	1381	60	1
Percentage of Total Placements	FY08	100%	7%	28%	63%	3%	0%
	FY09	100%	6%	28%	63%	3%	0%
	FY10	100%	6%	24%	66%	3%	0%
<i>DJS Exits during FY (count of placements, not Children)</i>							
Numbers	FY08	2130	140	597	1330	63	0
	FY09	2196	128	625	1380	63	0
	FY10	2075	126	561	1330	58	0
Percentage of Total Placements	FY08	100%	7%	28%	62%	3%	0%
	FY09	100%	6%	28%	63%	3%	0%
	FY10	100%	6%	27%	64%	3%	0%
<i>DJS Placements (Children) at end of FY</i>							
Numbers	FY08	977	82	304	579	12	0
	FY09	895	82	272	532	9	0
	FY10	889	82	217	579	11	1
Percentage of Total Placements	FY08	100%	8%	31%	59%	1%	0%
	FY09	100%	9%	30%	60%	1%	0%
	FY10	100%	9%	24%	65%	1%	0%

**Table 16: DJS Population Flow, Placements, FY08-FY10**

## **Per-Diem Placement Costs**

Between FY09 and FY10, the education cost of children increased by 14% from \$7,032,391 to \$8,042,921. The administrative cost increased only by 3% from \$39,130,646 in FY09 to \$40,201,070 in FY10. The combined administrative and education cost increase was 4%.

<i>DJS Per-Diem OOH Placement Payments, FY09-FY10</i>			
<b>FY</b>	<b>Per-Diem Placement Costs</b>	<b>Educational Cost</b>	<b>Administrative Costs</b>
FY09	\$46,163,037	\$7,032,391	\$39,130,646
FY10	\$48,243,991	\$8,042,921	\$40,201,070
Change from FY09	4%	14%	3%

**Table 17: DJS Per-Diem Out of Home Placement Payments, FY09-FY10**

**State Operated Committed Placement Costs:** Between FY09 and FY10, the State operated total committed placement cost including both educational and administrative costs were reduced by 16% from \$30,578,970 in FY09 to \$25,775,702 in FY10.

## **Out-of-State vs. In-State Placements**

The majority of DJS children committed to OOH placements are in-State. As of January 31, 2010, the in-State children count accounted for 90% of the total committed population. One of the goals of The Maryland Model is to treat Maryland's children in Maryland. DJS started the Victor Cullen facility in FY08 and Silver Oak Academy in FY10, both in-State programs.

<i>As of January 31, 2008 – Out of Home Placement</i>							
<b>In-Out State</b>	<b>Family Home Settings</b>	<b>Community-Based Residential Placement</b>	<b>Non-Community Based Residential Placement</b>	<b>Hospitalization</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<b>In-State</b>	87	288	467	8	0	850	89%
<b>OOS</b>	0	0	107	0	0	107	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>574</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>As of January 31, 2009</i>							
<b>In-State</b>	83	236	449	8	0	776	88%
<b>OOS</b>	0	1	107	0	0	108	12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>884</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>As of January 31, 2010</i>							
<b>In-State</b>	95	265	473	7	0	840	90%
<b>OOS</b>	0	0	92	0	1	93	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>933</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 18: DJS Out of Home Placement by One-day Count**



## Placements by Gender

The proportion of male to female placements remains the same with 86% male at the end of FY08 and the same percentage at the end of FY10. Females comprise 14% (Table 19). However, the proportion of male to female by each placement category varies.

	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010			
Female %	Start FY	Adm <sup>12</sup> During FY	Rel <sup>13</sup> During FY	End FY	Start FY	Adm During FY	Rel During FY	End FY	Start FY	Adm During FY	Rel During FY	End FY
Male %	86%	87%	87%	86%	86%	84%	85%	83%	83%	84%	83%	86%
Female %	14%	13%	13%	14%	14%	16%	15%	17%	17%	16%	17%	14%
<b>Total #</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>2161</b>	<b>2130</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>2119</b>	<b>2196</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>2079</b>	<b>2075</b>	<b>889</b>

**Table 19: DJS Gender Demographics by FY**

## Placements by Race

African-American placements increased from 66% at the start of FY08 to 72% at the end of FY10 while the white race group decreased from 28% to 23% during the same time (Table 20)

	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010			
RACE	Start FY	Adm During FY	Rel During FY	End FY	Start FY	Adm During FY	Rel During FY	End FY	Start FY	Adm During FY	Rel During FY	End FY
American Indian or Alaska Native	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
African American or Black	66%	64%	65%	64%	63%	66%	64%	67%	67%	72%	70%	72%
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
White or Caucasian	28%	30%	29%	31%	31%	30%	31%	28%	28%	23%	25%	23%
AA/WH	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other (Hispanics/Latinos)	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%
Unknown	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>2161</b>	<b>2130</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>2119</b>	<b>2196</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>2079</b>	<b>2075</b>	<b>889</b>

**Table 20: DJS Race Demographics by FY**

<sup>12</sup> Adm=Admissions

<sup>13</sup> Rel=Released

## Placements by Age

DJS has made efforts to implement alternatives to placements in non-residential services as the first placement option (Table 21). DJS has been successful in treating younger children in alternative placements.

Fiscal Year	11-13	14-16	17-18	Over 18	Total	Median Age	Average Age
FY08	5%	55%	40%	1%	3111	16.4	16.3
FY09	4%	53%	42%	1%	3096	16.5	16.4
FY10	3%	53%	42%	2%	2974	16.6	16.5

**Table 21: DJS Age Demographics by FY**

## County of Residence

Based on FY10 data in the “Start in FY” column (table 22) out-of-home placements, the majority of children in placement are Baltimore City (26%) residents, followed by residents from Prince George’s (16%), Montgomery (10%), Anne Arundel (9%), and Baltimore (8%) Counties.

Jurisdiction	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010			
	Placement at Start FY	Start in FY	Ends in FY	Placements at End of FY	Placement at Start FY	Start in FY	End in FY	Placements at end of FY	Placement Start of FY	Start in FY	End in FY	Placement at end of FY
Allegany	16	36	30	21	21	26	35	12	12	26	27	11
Anne Arundel	57	155	149	63	63	159	151	71	71	178	168	81
Baltimore City	172	490	449	212	212	498	494	213	213	535	522	224
Baltimore County	78	175	172	81	81	183	195	69	69	158	140	86
Calvert	22	40	37	25	25	44	48	21	21	21	33	9
Caroline	18	17	24	11	11	19	22	8	8	16	18	6
Carroll	32	72	60	44	44	71	93	22	22	49	48	23
Cecil	13	21	20	14	14	24	23	15	15	18	25	8
Charles	46	63	80	29	29	83	87	25	25	91	83	33
Dorchester	12	15	18	9	9	23	24	8	8	14	18	4
Frederick	32	93	92	33	33	77	70	40	40	59	76	23
Garrett	4	16	14	6	6	13	12	7	7	15	17	5
Harford	17	51	42	26	26	57	57	26	26	31	47	10
Howard	17	26	35	8	8	28	31	5	5	27	24	8
Kent	10	19	19	10	10	18	22	6	6	8	9	5
Montgomery	115	250	246	118	118	210	244	83	83	198	189	90
Prince George’s	117	264	282	99	99	273	255	117	117	323	313	124
Queen Anne’s	8	23	20	11	11	28	27	12	12	14	19	6
Somerset	11	14	17	8	8	11	13	6	6	9	7	8
St. Mary’s	23	52	53	22	22	46	52	16	16	39	37	17
Talbot	6	29	21	14	14	15	21	8	8	11	16	3
Washington	38	95	95	38	38	66	74	30	30	91	81	40
Wicomico	51	76	91	36	36	83	73	45	45	83	97	31
Worcester	10	41	31	20	20	37	41	16	16	34	33	17
Out of State	25	28	33	19	19	27	32	14	14	31	28	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>2161</b>	<b>2130</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>977</b>	<b>2119</b>	<b>2196</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>2079</b>	<b>2075</b>	<b>889</b>

**Table 22: DJS FY08 - 10 Placements by County of Residence (COR)**

## ***Resource Development***

### **Department Initiatives**

Evidence Based Programs (EBPs): The Maryland Model for Juvenile Services that was initiated in FY08 is a regionalized service model that includes EBPs and the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP). Evidence based programs include Functional Family Therapy (FFT), Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) and Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC). Both MST and FFT implementation are having a positive impact on the reduction of DJS out-of-home placements. The MST programs are being used primarily as group and therapeutic group home diversion programs for juveniles twelve to seventeen years of age. The typical profile of juveniles referred to MST is the same as the FFT programs. DJS funds MST programs in Baltimore City and Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, Howard, and Prince George's Counties, and looks forward to implementing this program in other jurisdictions and intends to do so as funding is available.

The Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP): The MCASP is an assessment tool utilized to determine placements and appropriate programs and services. The MCASP uses integrated case management to assess a child's risks and needs throughout the course of his involvement with DJS and to develop interventions that accomplish the dual goals of public safety and child rehabilitation. MCASP enables DJS to strengthen individualized service plans for the child and his family, matches the child with appropriate services and programs, track the child's progress, and ensure that each child receives the level of supervision consistent with his or her risk to public safety.

Treating Maryland's children in Maryland: A primary goal of the Maryland Model is to treat Maryland's children in Maryland. As of January 31, 2010, the in-State children count accounted for 90% of the total committed population. DJS expects the creation of two new treatment facilities to further reduce the number of children in out-of-State programs.

### **Gaps and Needs**

MST and FFT programs started in FY09 and the expanded delivery of these two programs to all jurisdictions could result in further reduction of group home placements. The DJS is validating the MCASP tool and the goal is to match every child to a proper placement setting. Case managers are receiving the necessary training to utilize the MCASP. DJS estimates that it may take another year to reach Statewide utilization of the MCASP.

Since the closure of Hickey committed programs in 2005, the number of committed children waiting for placement increased. DJS' current capital plan addresses the need for site selection of a new 48 bed secure, State-run committed treatment program for boys in Baltimore City. In FY11, the DJS will also begin the planning for a new staff-secure privately-operated treatment program for committed girls. DJS expects the creation of the new treatment facilities to reduce the number of children requiring placement in out-of-State programs.

## *Section III: Family Home Settings*

### **Overview**

In this section an analysis of the number of placements for Family Homes Settings will be discussed. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding agencies represented in this category. Family Home Settings include the following placements: Relative (Kinship) Care, Foster Care, Treatment Foster Care and Adoptive Care and Individual Family Care and Living Arrangement – Family Home. A definition of each placement is listed below.

### **Definitions**

**Pre-Adoptive Care (Adoptive):** Out-of-home placement services provided to a child when the permanency plan is adoption but an adoptive family is not yet available or the child is not ready for permanent placement.

**Foster Care:** Continuous 24-hour care and supportive services provided for a minor child placed by an LDSS. Foster care includes: services to the child's parent(s) or legal guardian, sibling(s), and relative(s) in order to achieve a safe, permanent placement for the child, supervision of the child in the foster care placement to assure that the placement promotes the child's physical, emotional, and intellectual growth and well-being and post-placement services to the child and the child's caregiver to prevent placement disruption or reentry into out-of-home placement. Foster care placements are made only for children who are abused, neglected, abandoned, or dependent on the State.

**Individual Family Care (Individual Family):** Individual family care (IFC) is a private, single family residence which provides a home for up to three individuals with developmental disabilities, who are unrelated to the care provider.

**Living Arrangement- Family Home (Living Arrangement-FH):** This placement includes children who are returned to their biological caregivers after an out-of-home placement, non-residential living situation for children old enough to live without adult supervision, and "Community-Based Behavioral Respite" which is relief services provided by a community residential licensee designed to meet the individual behavioral needs of a child with a serious emotional disturbance disability for not more than 30 days in a community-based setting.

**Relative-Kinship-Care (Relative Care):** Provides efforts to place children in short-term substitute care with relatives rather than unrelated foster parents when out-of-home placement is required because of abuse, neglect, or abandonment. Formal Kinship Care placements are not paid.

**Treatment Foster Care (TFC):** Designed to provide short-term substitute care for children removed from their homes with services to families to achieve permanency plans through family reunification or alternative permanent placement when reunification is not possible. TFC placements are made only for children who are abused, neglected, abandoned, or dependent on the State. These children also need special treatment. The State will pay additional money (fixed amount per month) based on the needs of the child. Maryland has four levels for treatment.

### **Family Home Settings: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010**

Table 23 (page 42) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of out-of-home placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction who are also placed in that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.

*Family Home Settings: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction*


Family Home Settings, All Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	99	1.5%	88	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Anne Arundel	92	1.4%	0	63	8	5	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Baltimore	400	6.2%	0	8	214	101	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	31	8	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	10	2
Baltimore City	3966	61.1%	0	128	775	2551	0	0	22	12	28	4	4	1	110	83	0	9	121	0	1	2	0	8	2	1	70	34
Calvert	50	0.8%	0	1	0	0	38	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Caroline	26	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Carroll	19	0.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cecil	105	1.6%	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	76	0	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	7	1
Charles	86	1.3%	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	16	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Frederick	119	1.8%	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	81	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	3	1
Garrett	38	0.6%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Harford	212	3.3%	0	1	21	23	1	0	1	14	0	1	2	0	134	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	0
Howard	36	0.6%	0	1	4	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kent	14	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Montgomery	387	6.0%	0	4	12	9	2	0	6	0	3	0	9	2	0	7	0	266	42	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	11	0
Prince George's	428	6.6%	0	5	4	9	6	0	1	0	26	0	0	0	1	4	0	23	329	0	0	5	0	1	1	0	13	0
Queen Anne's	20	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Somerset	37	0.6%	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	2	0	0	15	2	0	0
St. Mary's	78	1.2%	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	3	1	0	3	8	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	3
Talbot	17	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	1
Washington	143	2.2%	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	122	0	0	5	0
Wicomico	62	1.0%	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	40	2	0	0
Worcester	35	0.5%	0	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	9	12	1	0
OOS	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	6	0.1%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	6492	100.0%	93	215	1044	2733	54	30	60	106	155	33	99	46	290	128	13	303	524	26	24	46	8	179	79	17	141	46
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			88.9%	68.5%	53.5%	64.3%	76.0%	73.1%	84.2%	72.4%	83.7%	56.3%	68.1%	89.5%	63.2%	50.0%	71.4%	68.7%	76.9%	70.0%	35.1%	44.9%	17.6%	85.3%	64.5%	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			1.4%	3.3%	16.1%	42.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.9%	1.6%	2.4%	0.5%	1.5%	0.7%	4.5%	2.0%	0.2%	4.7%	8.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	2.8%	1.2%	0.3%	2.2%	0.7%

Table 23: Family Home Settings January 31, 2010

## Family Home Settings: Statewide Summary

There were 6,492 placements in Family Home Setting on the one-day count. This includes children in Kinship care and other relative placements (formal and informal); Regular Foster Care, Treatment Foster Care, as well and Pre-adoptive (Adoptive) homes.

Children were placed into Family Home Settings by DHR, and DJS. Figure 7 provides a visual representation of the number of placements in Family Home Settings by placing agency.




**Figure 7: Number of Placements in Family Home Settings Placements by Placing Agency**

### **Family Home Settings Placement by Type Across Agencies**

36% of the children in Family Home Settings were placed with relatives who had a formal arrangement with the LDSS to provide care (see Figure 8, page 44). This type of placement is also referred to as Kinship Care or Restricted Foster Care. All children placed in foster care with relatives are placed by DHR. The next highest percentage of placements, 33%, was in TFC. Families who provide TFC are either licensed under the auspices of a private child placement agency or the LDSS. TFC provides a higher level of supervision and clinical services as compared to foster care. Foster Care, 22% of the Family Home Settings placements, is provided by non-relative homes under the auspices of the LDSS.

## Family Home Settings by Placement Type



**Figure 8: Number and Percentage of Placements in Family Home Settings**



## DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

### *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements in Family Home Settings*

DHR's Place Matters Initiative, which began in 2007, has increased the percentage of children in family home settings at the beginning of each fiscal year over the past three years, even as the total number of children in family home settings has decreased over the same time period (see Table 9, page 28). A central principle of Place Matters – keeping children who require out-of-home care in the least restrictive placement possible, ideally family foster homes, has resulted in a three three-year trend of increasing proportions of children at the beginning of each fiscal year placed in family foster homes, and an increasing percentage of children entering family foster homes (Table 9, page 28). Over 70% of children placed by DHR in out-of-home care are in family foster homes (Table 9, page 28).

Table 24 shows increases in entries into family foster care placements, which is likely the result the increasing use of family foster homes as the first placement for children newly entering DHR OOH care, and the transferring of children already in DHR out-of-home care to family foster homes as their level of needs are evaluated and their placements adjusted to allow them to be in the least restrictive level of care. As each fiscal year's exit numbers are higher than the number of entries, the overall population of children in family foster homes has decreased.

<i>Population Flow – Family Home Settings (count of placements, not children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY	Ends in FY	Placements at End of FY
FY08	7006	6740	6878	6868
FY09	6868	7606	7734	6740
FY10	6740	7900	8473	6167
Change from FY08	-4%	17%	23%	-10%
Average Yearly Change	-2%	8%	11%	-5%
Recent Year Change	-2%	4%	10%	-9%

**Table 24: DHR Population Flow – Family Home Settings**

### **In- State & OOS**

Nearly all DHR family foster home placements are in-State. On January 31, 2010, 98.4% of all family foster home placements were in-State. Of the remaining 1.6% family foster home placements that were OOS, the majority were adoptive, relative/kinship, or family home placements. Only 8.6% of the OOS family foster home placements were for TFC (Table 25, page 46).

<i>January 31, 2010 – Family Foster Home Out of State Placements</i>				
FFH Category	OOS	Total (In-state & OOS)	OOS Percent of Category	Percent of all Family Foster Home OOS
Adoptive Care	6	98	6.1%	5.7%
Foster Care	0	1453	0.0%	0.0%
Relative/Kinship Care	77	2314	3.3%	73.3%
TFC	9	2066	0.4%	8.6%
LA - Family Home	13	466	2.8%	12.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>6397</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 25: Family Foster Home Out of State Placements on January 31, 2010**

## ***Gender, Race and Age***

### **Gender**

Three-year data on the gender distribution for DHR family foster home placements shows that boys comprise slightly less than half of all placements with girls conversely comprising more than half of all placements (Table 26). As three years of data is insufficient to fully discern if where the increasing gap between boys and girls represents a significant trend or an anomaly, further tracking and analysis over the next few years will be needed.

<i>DHR Family Foster Homes – Percent of Placements by Gender</i>		
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female
FY08	49%	50.9%
FY09	48.5%	51.5%
FY10	47%	53%

**Table 26: DHR Family Foster Homes by FY**

### **Race**


Over the past three years, the proportion of children by race in DHR family foster homes has been consistent - slightly more than two-thirds (68%) of children are black/African-American, approximately one-quarter (24%) are white, and approximately 4% are identified as bi-racial or of multiple races. All other racial categories comprise less than 2% each (Table 27 page 47)

<i>DHR Family Foster Homes – Percent of Placements by Race</i>									
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>American Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Bi-Racial/ Multiple Races Identified</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Data Unavailable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>FY08</b>	0.1%	0.2%	67.2%	0.0%	25.4%	3.9%	1.2%	1.9%	100.0%
<b>FY09</b>	0.1%	0.2%	68.5%	0.1%	24.0%	3.8%	1.7%	1.7%	100.0%
<b>FY10</b>	0.1%	0.2%	68.1%	0.0%	24.0%	4.1%	2.0%	1.5%	100.0%

**Table 27: DHR Family Foster Homes – Percent of Placements by Race by FY**

### Age


Tables 28, below, and 29, page 48, show the distribution of children in DHR family foster homes, by age, on January 31, 2010. As children age, the percentage of children in family foster homes declines. Children six years old and younger are placed in family foster homes at the highest percentages of 96%-98%, decreasing to 91%-93% for children ages seven to nine placed in foster homes. As children reach ages 10-12, only 82%-89% are in family foster homes. This decreases to 75% for children at age 13, and decreases further to 70% and below for children 14 and older, and to the lowest rate (below 60%) for children 17 and older. Figure 9, page 48, illustrates divergence at age 13 between the number of children in DHR out-of-home care as compared to the number of children in DHR family foster homes.



**Table 28: Age Groups of Children in DHR Family Foster Homes on January 31, 2010**

<b>January 31, 2010 – Ages of Children in DHR Family Foster Homes</b>				
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Number of Children in Placement</b>	<b>Family Home Settings</b>	<b>Percent of All Children In OOH Care, in FFH, by Age Group<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>Percent of All Children in FFH</b>
Less than 1	305	293	96%	4.6%
1	402	393	98%	6.1%
2	395	386	98%	6.0%
3	337	325	96%	5.1%
4	269	259	96%	4.0%
5	244	236	97%	3.7%
6	211	203	96%	3.2%
7	233	213	91%	3.3%
8	240	223	93%	3.5%
9	249	228	92%	3.6%
10	284	254	89%	4.0%
11	299	265	89%	4.1%
12	340	280	82%	4.4%
13	345	260	75%	4.1%
14	459	320	70%	5.0%
15	548	355	65%	5.5%
16	689	440	64%	6.9%
17	820	485	59%	7.6%
18	730	396	54%	6.2%
19	640	328	51%	5.1%
20	476	255	54%	4.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,515</b>	<b>6,397</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 29: Ages of Children in DHR Family Foster Homes on January 31, 2010**



**Figure 9: # of Children in DHR OOH Care, Compared to Number of Children in DHR Family Foster Homes, by Age, on 1/31/10**

<sup>14</sup> Data on the number and percentages of children in specific categories of placements (such as Family Foster Homes) for the one-day count is taken from data entered into MD CHESSE, and is based on the actual physical location of the child on that day, regardless of the child's long-term placement. For example, if a child has a long-term family foster home placement, but is hospitalized on 1/31/10 due to somatic or psychiatric illness, that child would be considered to be in a hospitalization level of care. This methodology eliminates possible duplication of children in overlapping categories, as DHR often continues to maintain foster home placements even while a child is in a short-term hospitalization/home-visit/etc. in order to maintain consistency for that child. Other factors to consider are that although it might be expected that all young children be in family foster home settings, some may be in hospitalizations (especially drug-exposed newborns) and, lastly, a small number of children's record may not have been updated by the caseworker, especially if the placement was new.

## ***Three-Year Trend Analysis for Cost***

In December 2008, DHR began using the child's placement record in MD CHESSIE as the source of the foster care placement payment. This change represents a significant milestone in MD CHESSIE development, data entry, and confidence in data accuracy. Linking payment data with child-specific records allows DHR to collect information on placement categories such as family foster homes, although due to the date of this conversion (half-way through FY09), data for FY08 and FY09 is not available). FY10 data is available and shown in Table 30.

<b><i>DHR Out of Home Placement Costs – Family Foster Homes, FY10</i></b>		
<b><i>Categories</i></b>	<b><i>Placement Costs</i></b>	<b><i>Educational Costs</i></b>
<b>All placement Costs</b>	\$250,702,227	\$9,134,127
<b>Family Home Settings (cost)</b>	\$128,423,998	\$1,936,147
<b>Family Home Settings (percent of all costs)</b>	51%	21%

**Table 30: DHR Out -of -Home Placement Costs – Family Foster Homes, FY10**

Although Table 9, page 28, shows that family foster home placements comprise approximately 70%-75% of all new and point-in-time DHR out-of-home placements, it is not surprising that in FY10 these placements comprise only 51% and 21% of DHR's total placement and educations costs, respectively FY10 (Table 30). Family foster homes are the least expensive category of placements available to DHR; in fact, as these placements include trial home visits, some family foster home placements require no DHR payment. Additionally, children in family foster homes tend to be young, with nearly 96% to 98% of children ages 6 and younger placed in family foster homes (Table 29, page 48). Children in this age group comprise nearly a third of all family foster home placements (Table 29, page 48). While children below school-age may require some educational services for special needs, this is likely at a significantly lower rate than that of older children and adolescents, who may need specialized educational placements due to long-standing educational/special needs and/or behavioral issues.

## ***Resource Development***

### **Gaps and needs**

Table 31, page 50, shows data reported on January 31, 2010, regarding the percentage of children in family foster homes placed in their home jurisdiction. Although this data provides a preliminary analysis of family foster home utilization, it should be interpreted cautiously; percentages of children placed in home jurisdictions are influenced by a variety of issues, including availability of providers, availability of providers matching children's specific needs, availability of supportive services needed for children with special needs, or special circumstances for individual children, i.e. placement with relatives out of jurisdiction, etc.

Through ongoing communication with DHR, the LDSSs have identified their jurisdictions' needs for homes. The State needs family foster homes for:

- youth ages 16 - 20;
- children with disabilities and special needs, including medically fragile children;
- gay, lesbian, and trans-gender youth;
- sibling groups of 3 or more; and
- African-American and other racial and ethnic groups.

<i><b>DHR Family Foster Home Placements – Percent of Children Placed In Home Jurisdiction</b></i>	
<b>LDSS</b>	<b>1/31/2010</b>
Allegany	87.64%
Anne Arundel	68.54%
Baltimore City	64.70%
Baltimore County	53.28%
Calvert	75.51%
Caroline	72%
Carroll	84.21%
Cecil	72.38%
Charles	84.34%
Dorchester	50%
Frederick	67.80%
Garrett	88.89%
Harford	63.03%
Howard	50%
Kent	69.23%
Montgomery	68.41%
Prince George's	76.21%
Queen Anne's	62.50%
St. Mary's	44.16%
Somerset	35.14%
Talbot	17.65%
Washington	84.89%
Wicomico	59.62%
Worcester	28.13%
<b>Maryland</b>	<b>65.52%</b>

**Table 31: DHR Family Foster Home Placements**

### **Agency Initiatives**

Currently, each LDSS is involved in the development and implementation of a local plan for recruitment and retention of foster and adoptive parents. Each LDSS is analyzing data to identify the children most in need of family homes and to develop foster parent recruitment plans specific to this population of children. These recruitment plans have been submitted to DHR for approval and funding and will positively influence the coordinated development of resources at the local level.

## **Data Highlights**

- Approximately 70% of children in DHR out-of-home care are in family foster homes.
- DHR has increased the percentage of children in family foster homes at the beginning of the fiscal year from 69.5% in FY08 to more than 75% in FY10, and entries into family foster homes have increased from 62% in FY08 to more than 70% in FY10.
- There has been a 10% reduction in the number of children in family foster homes from the end of FY08 to the end of FY10.
- Only 1.6% of children in family foster homes are placed OOS; of those children, more than 91% were placed OOS in order to be with adoptive parents, relatives, or other family members.
- For the past three fiscal years, the racial breakdown of children in family foster homes has remained consistent. Approximately 68% of children are black/African-American and approximately 24% are white. All other races each comprise less than 4% of the family foster home child population.
- The largest groups of children in family foster homes are the youngest and oldest - children under the age of 6, and children ages 16 to 20. Each of these age groups comprises nearly 30% of the family foster home population.
- Until age 10, more than 90% of all children in DHR out-of-home care are in family foster homes. Of all children ages 10 to 13, 82%–89% are in family foster homes. After age 13, however, these percentages continue to decline with 75% of children age 13 in family foster homes, 64%-70% of children ages 14 – 16 and fewer than 60% of children ages 17 – 20.
- Although family foster home placements comprised approximately 70%-75% of all DHR placements in FY10, these placements were responsible for only 51% of all placement costs, and only 21% of all education costs.

## **Recommendations**

1. Continue initiatives such as Place Matters and Family Centered Practice as strategies to: prevent out-of-home placements, place children with relatives and/or close to home, and ensure that families receive needed services to support children in being reunified as quickly and safely as possible.
2. Continue and expand strategies to recruit family foster homes statewide, focusing on:
  - a. children over age 13;
  - b. children with disabilities and special needs;
  - c. gay, lesbian, and transgender children;
  - d. sibling groups; and
3. African-American and other racial and ethnic groups.
4. Provide additional supports to public family foster homes to increase their ability to care for children with special needs.

5. Provide funding for the strategies that the LDSSs identify as effective in recruiting foster parents.
6. Provide additional resources for LDSSs to move children from higher levels of care to family foster homes, e.g., from group homes and treatment foster care to public resource homes).
7. Utilize the Family Finder program to locate family resources for children entering out-of-home care.
8. Increase availability of and access to community-based services to enable children to remain in family settings.



## DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

### *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements in Family Home Settings*

Family home settings include foster care and treatment foster care placements. Of the total DJS placements over the past three years, family home settings placements ranged between 7% and 9%. As of January 31, 2010, total placements in family settings were 10% less as compared to FY08. The proportion of during the year placements and exits remained the same (Table 32).

<i>Population Flow – Family Home Settings (count of placements or children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY	Ends in FY	Placements at End of FY
FY08	79	143	140	82
FY09	82	128	128	82
FY10	82	128	126	82
Change from FY08	3%	-10%	-10%	0%
Average Yearly Change	1%	-5%	-5%	0%
Recent Year Change	-1%	0%	-2%	1%

**Table 32: DJS Population Flow – Family Home Settings**

### *Gender, Race and Age*

#### **Gender**

Table 33 demonstrates that male placements decreased by 5 percentage points, thus increasing female placements by 5 percentage points.

<i>DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Placements by Gender</i>		
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female
FY08	83%	17%
FY09	79%	21%
FY10	78%	22%

**Table 33: DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Placements by Gender**

## Race

When identifying placements by race, African-Americans ranked the highest with just over 65% of the total placements (Table 34).

<i>DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Placements by Race</i>									
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Bi-Racial/Multiple Races Identified</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Data Unavailable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>FY08</b>	0.0%	0.5%	66.2%	0.0%	30.2%	0.5%	2.3%	0.5%	100.0%
<b>FY09</b>	0.0%	0.5%	66.7%	0.0%	29.5%	0.0%	2.9%	0.5%	100.0%
<b>FY10</b>	0.5%	0.0%	65.1%	0.0%	28.7%	0.0%	5.3%	0.5%	100.0%

**Table 34: DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Placements by Race**

## Age

The average age at the time of placement increased from 16.5 in FY08 to 16.9 in FY10 as illustrated by Table 35.

<i>DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Placements by Age</i>								
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>11-13</b>	<b>14-16</b>	<b>17-18</b>	<b>Over 18</b>	<b>Not Specify</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Median Age</b>	<b>Average Age</b>
<b>FY08</b>	6%	49%	43%	2%	0%	222	16.7	16.5
<b>FY09</b>	7%	42%	49%	3%	0%	210	17.0	16.7
<b>FY10</b>	6%	37%	50%	7%	0%	209	17.2	16.9

**Table 35: DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Placements by Age**

Table 36, page 55, shows as of January 31, 2010 percentage of children placed by county of residence (COR) in family home settings out of the total population of OOH placements. For example, on January 31, 2010 62.5% of the children in OOH Placements from Allegany County were placed by the DJS in Family Home settings.

<i>DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Children Placed by COR</i>	
<b>COR</b>	<b>1/31/2010</b>
Allegany	62.5%
Anne Arundel	3.9%
Baltimore City	9.3%
Baltimore County	5.7%
Calvert	6.7%
Caroline	12.5%
Carroll	0.0%
Cecil	0.0%
Charles	12.5%
Dorchester	33.3%
Frederick	3.0%
Garrett	33.3%
Harford	5.9%
Howard	0.0%
Kent	33.3%
Montgomery	4.5%
Prince George's	11.4%
Queen Anne's	44.4%
St. Mary's	6.7%
Somerset	0.0%
Talbot	0.0%
Washington	10.3%
Wicomico	32.3%
Worcester	13.6%
Out-of-State	7.1%
<b>Maryland</b>	<b>10.2%</b>

**Table 36: DJS Family Home Settings – Percent of Children Placed by COR**

## ***Resource Development***

### **Gaps and Needs:**

With diversion programs in place, DJS continues to place a low number of children in foster care or therapeutic foster care. DJS provides an array of services including MST and FFT for those children who can stay at home.

### **Highlights:**

- Over the past three years, approximately 8% of placements were committed placements to family home settings.
- Male placements decreased by 5%, thus increasing the female placements by 5%.
- African-Americans ranked the highest with 65% of the total placements.
- The average age at the time of placement increased from 16.5 in FY08 to 16.9 in FY10.
- The majority of children residing in Allegany (63%) and Queen Anne's (44%) Counties were placed in family home settings.

## ***Section IV: Community-Based Residential Programs***

### **Overview**

An analysis of the number of placements for Community-Based Residential Programs is discussed in this section and includes a summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Community-Based Residential Programs (CB) includes the following placements: Independent Living, Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA), and Residential Child Care Programs (RCCPs). Each of these placements is defined below.

### **Definitions**

**Independent Living Programs:** Independent living programs must operate under the auspices of a child placement agency licensed by the DHR Office of Licensing and Monitoring in accordance with Code of Maryland Annotated Regulations 07.05.01 and 07.05.04. These programs are designed for older children mature enough to function autonomously for the most part. Children live in apartments and attend college, high school, trade schools, or engage in other training preparation programs with minimal Agency supervision. The program is designed to teach self sufficiency and independent living skills because of the unlikelihood of returning home. Children may reside in a foster care home or group home, including a **supervised apartment unit**, and must be enrolled in high school, college, vocational training, or be employed.

**Living Arrangements- Community Based:** Includes placements in an institution of higher learning; children in this category typically live on-campus, a halfway house, temporary shelter placement for homeless children, or a residential program for job training.

**Residential Child Care Programs (RCCP):** Provides 24-hour per day care for children with a structured set of services and activities that are designed to achieve specific objectives relative to the needs of the children served. Includes the provision of food, clothing, shelter, education, social services, health, mental health, recreation, or any combination of these services and activities. An RCCP includes those that are licensed by DHMH; DHR; or DJS; and are subject to the regulations governing the operation of RCCPs.

**Alternative Living Unit (ALU):** A program that provides services in a structured, staff staff-supervised home licensed by DHMH/DDA for individuals who, because of developmental

disability, require specialized care. The service setting is one to three developmentally developmentally-delayed children with systemic problems.

**Community-Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA):** A residence:

- (a) Which is rented or owned by an individual or the individual's family or proponent or held in trust for an individual;
- (b) Where an individual lives as a roommate without the individual's name appearing on the lease or title; or
- (c) Where the licensee is the guarantor of rental or mortgage payments for an individual receiving CSLA services.

Services to assist an individual in non-vocational activities necessary to enable that individual to live in the individual's own home, apartment, family home, or rental unit, with (i) No more than two other nonrelated recipients of these services; or (ii) Members of the same family regardless of their number.

CSLA include:

- (i) Personal assistance services;
- (ii) Supports that enhance the individual's opportunity for community participation and to exercise choice and control over the individual's own life;
- (iii) Training and other services necessary to assist the individual in achieving and maintaining increased integration, interdependence, and productivity;
- (iv) 24-hour emergency assistance;
- (v) Assistive technology;
- (vi) Adaptive equipment;
- (vii) Resource coordination;
- (viii) Environmental modifications;
- (ix) Respite services; and
- (x) Other services as approved by the Secretary or the Secretary's designee.

**DDA Group Home:** A residence owned, leased, or operated by a DDA licensee that: (a) Provides residential services for individuals who, because of a developmental disability, require specialized living arrangements; (b) Admits at least 4 individuals but not more than 8; and (c) Provides 10 or more hours of supervision per unit, per week.

**Group Home:** Services provided to children who need more supervision than a relative, foster parent or treatment foster parent can provide. A program that provides varying levels of care based on the abilities, disabilities and functioning of children referred and placed.

**High Intensity Group Home:** A group home that provides services to children presenting emotional and/or behavioral conditions requiring a higher level of structured supervision, behavior management and clinical intervention.

**Medically Fragile Program (MFP):** A program designed to serve a child who is dependent upon any combination of the following: mechanical ventilation for at least part of each day; intravenous administration of nutritional substances or drug; other device-based respiratory or nutritional support on a daily basis, including tracheotomy tube care, suctioning, or oxygen support; other medical devices that compensate for vital body functions; including Apnea or cardio- respiratory monitors; renal dialysis; or other mechanical devices; or substantial nursing care in connection with disabilities.

**Respite Program:** Temporary care provided in a substitute care setting. The purpose may be to give relief to the caregiver, to regulate or change a child’s medication or treatment plan or to provide care while a child is awaiting permanent placement.

**Shelter Program:** Temporary care in an OOH placement due to serious allegations of parental abuse or neglect. Stays generally last from 30 to 90 days or until a court can determine whether a more permanent placement is appropriate.

**Therapeutic Group Home:** Services provided in a home (for 4 to 8 children) licensed by the DHMH Administration Office of Health Care Quality for children that need structure and supervision due to medically diagnosed disorders such as emotional disturbance, schizophrenia, or bi-polar disorder. It includes a formal program of basic care, social work, mental health and health care services, which can include the daily administration of medicine.

**Teen Mother Program:** A licensed residential program that provides care and services for children who are mothers with an infant.

### **Community-Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010**

Table 37 (page 60) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of OOH placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.

**Community-Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction**

Community Based Residential Programs, All Subcategories																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Placement Jurisdiction																									
			Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	10	0.6%	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2
Anne Arundel	79	4.6%	0	39	18	4	0	1	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0
Baltimore	202	11.8%	0	4	119	35	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	16	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	0
Baltimore City	678	39.5%	3	10	156	393	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	1	0	6	66	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	17	7
Calvert	14	0.8%	0	1	0	2	7	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Caroline	7	0.4%	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Carroll	26	1.5%	0	0	2	1	0	0	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0
Cecil	20	1.2%	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Charles	27	1.6%	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dorchester	3	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Frederick	46	2.7%	0	0	9	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	3	0
Garrett	10	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Harford	57	3.3%	1	1	19	5	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0
Howard	30	1.7%	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Kent	4	0.2%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	186	10.8%	2	2	26	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	4	0	111	6	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	5	0
Prince George's	192	11.2%	0	5	19	10	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Queen Anne's	4	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Somerset	9	0.5%	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
St. Mary's	24	1.4%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	8	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	1
Talbot	3	0.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	49	2.9%	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	30	1	0	2	0
Wicomico	21	1.2%	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4	0
Worcester	11	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	0	0	0
OOS	4	0.2%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1716	100.0%	8	65	416	475	7	12	16	18	24	0	18	17	28	38	3	142	247	3	12	7	3	63	21	9	52	12
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			20.0%	49.4%	58.9%	58.0%	50.0%	57.1%	57.7%	25.0%	55.6%	0.0%	28.3%	50.0%	22.8%	46.7%	75.0%	59.7%	71.4%	75.0%	22.2%	25.0%	66.7%	61.2%	57.1%	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.5%	3.8%	24.2%	27.7%	0.4%	0.7%	0.9%	1.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.6%	2.2%	0.2%	8.3%	14.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	3.7%	1.2%	0.5%	3.0%	0.7%

**Table 37: Community-Based Residential Placement on January 31, 2010**



## Community-Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary

There were 1,716 Community-Based Residential Placements as reported in the one-day count. Children were placed or funded in Community-Based Residential Placements by ADAA, DDA, DHR, DJS and MSDE. MSDE, although not a placement Agency, is a funding Agency. The graph below provides a visual representation of the number of Community-Based Residential Placements by placing or funding Agency.




Figure 10: Number of Community-Based Residential Placements by Placing or Funding Agency

### *Community-Based Residential Placement by Type Across Agencies*

Similar to Family Home Settings the majority of Community-Based Residential Placements, 77%, were made by DHR. DJS represented 15.4% of Community-Based Residential Placements.

Community-Based Residential Placements are divided into three large categories: Independent Living Programs (ILP), Living Arrangements (LA) and Residential Child Care Programs (RCCPs). Independent Living Programs account for 14%; LAs account for 4%, and RCCPs account for 81%, respectively, of the Community-Based Residential Placements.




Figure 11: Number of Community-Based Residential Placements by Category

# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ADMINISTRATION (DDA)

## *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements in Family Home Settings*

### Reduction in OOH Population

**Total DDA out-of-home placements have decreased by an average of 30% since the end of FY08.** Between FY08 and FY09, there was an overall 5% decrease in the number of placements that started and a 31% decrease in the number of placements that ended. Between FY09 and FY10 there was a slight increase (1%) in the number of placements that started and another 4% decrease in the number of placements that ended. This resulted in an overall average reduction of 30% placements from FY09-FY10, see table 38 for detailed information. This reduction may be a result of two distinct factors: DDA continuing its work to provide services to children *within* the family home and the more recent focus to ensure that children needing OOH placement access all entitlement services prior to accessing DDA funds for services.


<i>Placement Population Flow – All Placements (count of placements, not children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY (New Placements)	Ends in FY (Placement Exits)	Placements at End of FY
FY08	203	25	55	173
FY09	162	19	28	153
FY10	137	20	24	133
Change from FY08	-66%	-5.00%	-31.00%	-40.00%
Average Yearly Change	-46%	-2%	-18%	-30%
Recent Year Change	-25%	1%	-4%	-20%

**Table 38: Placement Population Flow**

## *Gender, Race and Age*

### Gender

The proportion of male and female children receiving funding for OOH placement from DDA remains constant - Figure 12, page 63 illustrates this trend. As the total number of children receiving funding for this service increases, the number of males to females' changes proportionately.



**Figure 12: DDA Gender Trends by FY**


<i>DDA Gender for Out of Home Care</i>	<b>FY08</b>	<b>FY09</b>	<b>FY10</b>
Male	144	238	100
Female	84	126	57
Not Determined	0	1	0

**Table 39: DDA Gender for Out of Home Care**

### Race

With respect to race, the same proportionate changes occur based on the total number of children for that fiscal year. Over the three year period, the three most common races of children receiving these services from DDA are “Black/African-American,” “White,” and “Other.”

While there are consistently more children who are white (33%) than black/African-American (27%), there is a high percentage (31%) of children who have been classified “other” and only one person in three years was classified as” Bi-Racial/Multiple Races” (1%).



**Figure 13: Percentage of Races for All Children Funded by DDA for Out-of-Home Care**


## Age

On January 31, 2010, the majority of children funded by DDA that resided in OOH placements (67%) were aged 16-20. When the age range is expanded to 11-20 years of age, the funding for OOH care for this range increases to 95% of all children receiving funding for this service. The percentage of children aged 0-10 receiving funding from DDA for OOH placement (5%) is extremely low and may be attributed to the fact that other State systems are the primary funding source for supporting infants and children outside of the home.

Table 40, reviews the one day data for the past three years (see Figure 14) supports this theory as the percentage of those children receiving funding from DDA for OOH placement continues to be primarily in the 11-20 year old age range.

<i>January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in DDA Out of Home Care</i>		
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Number in Care</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<b>less than 1</b>	0	0%
<b>1 - 5</b>	1	1%
<b>6 - 10</b>	5	4%
<b>11 - 15</b>	37	28%
<b>16 - 20</b>	88	67%

**Table 40: January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in DDA Out of Home Care**




**Figure 14: DDA Age Groups of Children in DDA Out of Home Care**

## Three-Year Trend Analysis for Cost

### Shift in Placement Types

From FY08 through FY10 there has been a shift in the types of placements for children receiving funding from DDA for OOH services. Throughout this three-year period, children have most often received services in a Community Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA), however, the ratio of CSLA to Group Home (GH) and Alternative Living Unit (ALU) has greatly varied. The DDA has been unable to determine the reason for this dramatic shift. It should be noted that in FY10, the highest percentage ever of children received services in the CSLA, a more natural home model.

Category	Subcategory	Agency Category	% of placements 2008	% of placements 2009	% of placements 2010
Community-Based Residential Placement	Residential Child Care Program	Community Supported Living Arrangement	86%	54%	91%
Community-Based Residential Placement	Residential Child Care Program	Alternative Living Unit and Group Home	12%	46%	9%
Family Home Settings	Individual Family Care	Individual Family Care	2%	0%	0%



**Table 41 & Figure 15: DDA Percent and Number of Placements by FY**

### Reduction in Placement Costs

From FY08 to FY10 there has been an overall reduction in the number of children receiving OOH services from DDA FY08 to FY10. Costs listed in Table 42, page 66, accurately represent the amount of money the DDA spent in FY08, FY09 and FY10 for Community Based Residential Programs as well as Community Living Arrangements. In addition to the reduction of children receiving OOH care, DDA has also reduced costs for OOH placements over the past three fiscal years. Total placement costs have fallen 30%, from approximately \$7.6 million in

FY08 to \$5.3 million in FY10 (see table 42, below). The greatest decrease in costs has been in the area of Community Based Residential Programs.

FY	Total Placement Costs	CSLA Placement Costs	Community Based Residential Programs Placement Costs
FY08	\$7,598,552	\$3,977,726	\$3,620,825
FY09	\$5,961,393	\$3,531,772	\$2,429,621
FY10	\$5,286,810	\$3,355,506	\$1,931,304
Change from FY08	-30%	-16%	-47%
Avg. Yearly Change	-17%	-8%	-27%
Recent Year Change	-11%	-5%	-21%

**Table 42: DDA Placement Costs by FY**

### **Data Quality Issues**

The inability to share data sources with other Administrations causes difficulty in planning for children supported by multiple sources. DDA typically represents its data as children receiving services vs. placements, most often reported on by other Administrations. The current DDA data system, PCIS2, does not have a data dictionary for data points. The lack of this type of resource has caused variations in the data to be collected based on start date of service vs. approval dates for service, children vs. placements, and contracts vs. individual costs.

### ***Resource Development***

#### **Gaps and needs**

The greatest challenge for DDA is in the identification and support of children ages of 18-21 who are aging out of other support systems. The identification of these children to allow for transition planning is critical to an effective transition process. Incompatible data systems between Administrations and confidentiality issues create barriers to this process.

During focus groups and community meetings held by DDA throughout the year regarding changes in the Low Intensity Support Services program, many family members reported that the ability to access these funds for respite and other services supported the family's ability to continue to support their child at home. Providing in-home supports and respite to families is an effectively utilized resource in preventing the need for an OOH placement.

#### **Agency Initiatives**

Since July 1, 2010, DDA has analyzed the data regarding the use of Low Intensity Support Funds. Preliminary analysis indicates that respite is the primary service requested from this funding source.

DDA is working in concert with DHR to develop a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding that will enable DDA to better plan for children transitioning out of the DHR system. The plan also indicates a commitment to at least annually cross train both DDA and DHR staff. It is the intent that the newly developed *Implementation Guide* will aid workers in both Agencies to complete the necessary information sharing and coordination to effectively transition children aging out of the DHR system.

DDA is working to establish a data dictionary with specific definitions and data collections procedures to be utilized for required reports. This dictionary will support DDA staff in consistency of information which will allow for accurate analysis to support future planning.

### **Data Highlights**

- For the past three fiscal years, the gender and racial breakdown of children receiving funding for OOH care has remained consistent relative to the number of children receiving this service.
- The largest age group of children receiving DDA funding for OOH care is 16 to 20 years of age (67%). Combined with children 11-15 years old, these two groups represent 95% of all children funded by DDA for OOH services.
- Over the three year period, an average of 77% of children have received services through the DDA Community Supported Living Arrangement (CSLA) model. In FY10, this number increased to 91%.
- Since FY08, DDA has decreased the cost of providing this service to children by 30%.

### **Recommendations**

- Continue work with other Agencies and Administrations and existing community resources to assist children to remain in their homes.
- Continue to explore the development of resources that will help families support their children with disabilities in their homes.

## DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

### *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements*

In the past three fiscal years, there has been a 22% decrease in the number of children placed in DHR community-based residential placements (end of fiscal year, Table 43). This significant reduction is primarily due to the success of DHR's Place Matters Initiative, which emphasizes the importance of placing children in the least restrictive placements possible, primarily in family foster homes. At the end of FY10, just over 14% of all children in DHR out-of-home care were living in community-based placements

<i>Population Flow – Community-Based Residential Placements (count of placements, not children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY	Ends in FY	Placements at End of FY
FY08	1550	2450	2461	1539
FY09	1539	2405	2556	1388
FY10	1388	2087	2270	1205
Change from FY08	-10%	-15%	-8%	-22%
Average Yearly Change	-5%	-8%	-4%	-12%
Recent Year Change	-10%	-13%	-11%	-13%

**Table 43: DHR Population Flow – Community-Based Residential Placements**

### *In-State & OOS*

Of all children in DHR community-based residential placements, 4%, (52 children) were placed OOS. The majority of these children (73%) are placed in group homes, with the remainder with developmental disabilities in various other types of placements (living arrangements) (Table 44, page 69).

Costs for one OOS provider alone, serving approximately 26 children, total \$4.2 million per fiscal year (\$3.7 million for placement costs, with the remainder for education costs. This provider serves children with developmental disabilities). This represents over \$161,000 per child per year - funds leaving the State of Maryland due to lack of needed in-State providers, and, most importantly, children placed out of their home community.



<i>January 31, 2010 – Community-Based Residential OOS Placements</i>				
Category	OOS	Total (In-state & OOS)	OOS Percent of Category	Percent of all Community- Based OOS
RCCP	38	1016	4%	73.1%
Living Arrangements	14	76	18%	26.9%
Independent Living Residential Program	0	229	0%	0%
Total	52	1321	4%	100%

**Table 44: Community-Based Residential Out of State Placements on January 31, 2010**

### ***Gender, Race and Age***

Over the past three fiscal years, slightly more males than females have been in placed in community community-based residential placements than females, with a three-year average of 55% males and 45% females (Table 45).

#### **Gender**

<i>DHR Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Placements by Gender</i>		
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female
FY08	53.2%	46.9%
FY09	56.3%	43.7%
FY10	55.9%	44.1%

**Table 45: DHR Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Placements by Gender**

As with family foster homes, the racial breakdowns for children in community-based residential placements have been consistent over a three-year period. Based on an average of the past three fiscal years, slightly more than 70% of children in these placements are Black/African-American, while approximately 23% are white. All other racial categories comprise 2% or less of the community-based population. (Table 46, page 70).

<b>DHR Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Placements by Race</b>									
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>American Indian / Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black or African-American</b>	<b>Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Bi-Racial / Multiple Races Identified</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Data Unavailable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>FY08</b>	*	0.4%	71.1%	*	23.5%	2.5%	0.8%	1.5%	100.0%
<b>FY09</b>	*	0.4%	71.6%	*	22.6%	2.6%	1.2%	1.5%	100.0%
<b>FY10</b>	*	*	69.1%	*	24.2%	2.9%	1.2%	1.9%	100.0%

*\*Due to the scale of numbers, data on children in these categories cannot be presented.<sup>15</sup>*

**Table 46: DHR Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Placements by Race**

### **Age**

Community-based residential placements are inherently different than family foster homes, and are designed for children with more intensive needs. Community-based placements are more appropriate for and needed by older children, and children ages 16 to 20 comprise nearly 74% of all DHR community-based placements (Table 47). Table 48, page 71, shows that children ages 18 and 19 comprise the largest age groups in community-based placements, a result of DHR's policy to encourage children without permanent placements/families at age 18 to remain in DHR custody in order to receive continued placement and other supportive services through age 20.

<b>January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in DHR Community-Based Residential Placements</b>		
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Under 6*	4	0.3%
6 - 10	50	3.8%
11 - 15	294	22.3%
16 - 20	973	73.7%
<b>Total</b>	1321	100.0%


**Table 47: DHR Community-Based Residential Placements by age on January 31, 2010**

The one-day count of January 31, 2010 demonstrates that children placed in DHR community-based residential placements comprise approximately 15.5% of the DHR out-of-of-home population (Table 48 and Figure 16, page 71), although these placements represent 42% of DHR's placement costs and 53% of the education costs (Table 49, page 72).

<sup>15</sup> When aggregate data show only a small number of children in any one category, confidentiality may be compromised, and so this data is suppressed.

<i>January 31, 2010 – Ages of Children in Community-Based Residential Placements</i>				
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Number of Children in placement</b>	<b>Community-Based Residential Placements</b>	<b>Percent of All Children In Age Group<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Percent of All Children in Community-Based Placements</b>
Less than 1	305	1	0.3%	0.1%
1	402	1	0.2%	0.1%
2	395	1	0.3%	0.1%
3	337	0	0.0%	0.0%
4	269	1	0.4%	0.1%
5	244	0	0.0%	0.0%
6	211	4	1.9%	0.3%
7	233	10	4.3%	0.8%
8	240	8	3.3%	0.6%
9	249	13	5.2%	1.0%
10	284	15	5.3%	1.1%
11	299	21	7.0%	1.6%
12	340	35	10.3%	2.6%
13	345	44	12.8%	3.3%
14	459	78	17.0%	5.9%
15	548	116	21.2%	8.8%
16	689	140	20.3%	10.6%
17	820	197	24.0%	14.9%
18	730	243	33.3%	18.4%
19	640	225	35.2%	17.0%
20	476	168	35.3%	12.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,515</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 48: DHR Ages of Children in Community-Based Residential Placements on January 31, 2010**



**Figure 16: Number of Children in DHR OOH Care, Compared to the Number of Children in DHR Community-Based Placements, on 1/31/10**

<sup>16</sup> Data on the number and percentages of children in specific categories of placements (such as Family Foster Homes) for the one-day count is taken from data entered into MD CHESSIE, and is based on the actual physical location of the child on that day, regardless of the child's long-term placement.

## *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Cost*

<i>DHR Out of Home Placement Costs – Community-Based Residential Placements, FY10</i>		
<i>Categories</i>	<i>Placement Costs</i>	<i>Educational Cost</i>
All placement costs	\$250,702,227	\$9,134,127
Community-Based Placements (cost)	\$105,271,600	\$4,795,893
Community-Based (percent of all costs)	42%	53%

**Table 49: DHR Out of Home Placement Costs – Community-Based Residential Placements, FY10**

## *Resource Development*

### Gaps and needs

In November 2009, DHR issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Residential Child Care providers. This RFP outlined DHR's current Statewide and jurisdictional needs, including the estimated number of beds needed Statewide. The number of bed days need is in parentheses:

- Diagnostic Evaluation and Treatment providers (100);
- Group Homes (600);
- High Intensity Group Homes (260);
- Teen Parent Providers (22);
- Medically Fragile (90);
- Developmentally Disabled (175); and
- Psychiatric Respite (45).

Table 50 page 73, shows data regarding the percentage of children in community-based placements who are placed in their home jurisdiction as reported on January 31, 2010. This data provides a preliminary analysis of community-based placement utilization and should be interpreted cautiously. Percentages of children placed in home jurisdictions are influenced by a variety of issues, including the availability of providers in general, availability of providers matching children's specific needs, or and special circumstances for individual children i.e., placement close to relatives out of jurisdiction, etc.

<b><i>DHR Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Children Placed In Home Jurisdiction</i></b>	
<b>LDSS</b>	<b>All Community-Based Placements</b>
	<b>1/31/2010</b>
Allegany	0%
Anne Arundel	24%
Baltimore City	52%
Baltimore County	50%
Calvert	0%
Caroline	*
Carroll	0%
Cecil	6%
Charles	20%
Dorchester	*
Frederick	14%
Garrett	44%
Harford	15%
Howard	35%
Kent	*
Montgomery	41%
Prince George's	64%
Queen Anne's	*
St. Mary's	0%
Somerset	0%
Talbot	*
Washington	53%
Wicomico	31%
Worcester	*
<b>Maryland</b>	<b>45%</b>

*\*Due to the scale of numbers, data on children in these categories cannot be presented.<sup>17</sup>*

**Table 50: DHR Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Children Placed In Home Jurisdiction**

<sup>17</sup> When aggregate data show only a small number of children in any one category, confidentiality may be compromised, and so this data is suppressed.

## **Data Highlights**

- Approximately 15%-16% of all children in DHR out-of-home care are living in community-based residential placements.
- For the period FY08 and FY10, at the end of each fiscal year, there has been a 22% reduction in children placed in community-based residential placements (at the end of the fiscal year), and a 15% decrease in entries into community-based placements. These reductions are attributable to the success of the Place Matters Initiative, which prioritizes placing children in family foster homes over other types of placements when possible, and if out-of-home care cannot be prevented, through supportive and other services to the family.
- 96% of all children in DHR community-based placements are in in-State placements.
- During the past three fiscal years, an average of 55% of community-based placements in OOH care were for males, with 45% for females.
- The three-year averages show that approximately 71% of children in community-based placements are black/African-American, and 23% of children are white.
- As expected, children in community-based placements are mostly older children. Nearly 74% are ages 16 to 20, and approximately 22% are ages 11 to 15. A large number of children in community-based placement are ages 18 to 20. This is attributable to DHR's encouragement of older children without permanent homes or families to remain in care after turning 18 in order to receive continued supports.
- Although community-based placements comprise approximately 15%-16% of all OOH placements, the costs of these placements represents 42% and 53% of all DHR out-of-home placement and education costs, respectively. This is not unexpected, as children in community-based placements are typically older and have more intensive needs than children in family foster homes, and as such require more expensive placements and more specialized (private) educational services.

## **Recommendations**

### **Collaborate with DHMH and the DDA to:**

- Expand and/or support in-State community-based residential providers for children and in particular, children with developmental disabilities. This strategy has the potential to prevent out-of-State placements for all children, including those with special needs.
- Continue the current RFP process in order for DHR to contract for needed community-based services.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

### *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements*

Community-based placements include admissions to Group Homes (GH), Therapeutic Group Homes (TGH), Independent Living (IL) and Alternative Living Units (ALU). About 28% of the total DJS placements were in community-based programs and this was reduced to 24% in FY10.

Table 51 shows community-based placements decreased by 11% from the start of FY08 to FY10. At the end of the FY10, this decrease was approximately 29% (305 in FY08 and 217 in FY10). By the end of FY10, there was a 15% decrease.

<i>Population Flow – Community-Based Residential Placement (count of placements or children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY	Ends in FY	Placements at End of FY
FY08	305	599	597	304
FY09	304	595	625	272
FY10	272	509	561	217
Change from FY08	-11%	-15%	-6%	-29%
Average Yearly Change	-5%	-8%	-3%	-15%
Recent Year Change	-11%	-14%	-10%	-20%

**Table 51: DJS Population Flow – Community-Based Residential Placement**

### *Gender, Race and Age*

#### Gender

Males accounted for 81% of the placements in FY08 and declined to 72% in FY10. Conversely, female placements increased from 19% in FY08 to 28% in FY10 as shown by Table 52.

<i>DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Gender</i>		
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female
FY08	81%	19%
FY09	75%	25%
FY10	72%	28%

**Table 52: DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Gender**

## Race

Over the past three years the proportion of African-American children has increased from 69% in FY08 to 76% in FY10 (Table 53). Conversely, table 53 illustrates that the White placements were reduced from 26% to 20%.

<i>DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Race</i>									
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>American Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Bi-Racial/ Multiple Races Identified</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Data Unavailable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>FY08</b>	0.4%	0.6%	68.8%	0.0%	26.0%	0.1%	4.1%	0.0%	100.0%
<b>FY09</b>	0.6%	0.2%	69.2%	0.0%	26.7%	0.0%	3.1%	0.2%	100.0%
<b>FY10</b>	0.3%	0.4%	76.0%	0.0%	20.4%	0.0%	2.7%	0.3%	100.0%

**Table 53: DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Race**

## Age

The average age at the time of placement increased from 16.1 in FY08 to 16.4 in FY10 (Table 54).

<b>DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Age</b>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>11-13</b>	<b>14-16</b>	<b>17-18</b>	<b>Over 18</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Median Age</b>	<b>Average Age</b>
<b>FY08</b>	8%	60%	31%	1%	904	16.2	16.1
<b>FY09</b>	6%	57%	35%	2%	899	16.4	16.3
<b>FY10</b>	5%	58%	34%	3%	783	16.5	16.4

**Table 54: DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Age**

Table 55, page 77, shows the percentage of children placed by their County of residence (COR) as of January 31, 2010 in Community-Based Residential placements out of the total population of OOH placements. For example, on January 31, 2010 29.9% of the children in OOH Placements from Anne Arundel County were placed by the DJS in Community-Based Residential placements.



<i><b>DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Children Placed by County of Residence (COR)</b></i>	
<b>COR</b>	<b>1/31/2010</b>
Allegany	0.0%
Anne Arundel	29.9%
Baltimore City	31.7%
Baltimore County	25.7%
Calvert	40.0%
Caroline	12.5%
Carroll	26.3%
Cecil	28.6%
Charles	37.5%
Dorchester	0.0%
Frederick	18.2%
Garrett	0.0%
Harford	23.5%
Howard	25.0%
Kent	66.7%
Montgomery	28.1%
Prince George's	32.1%
Queen Anne's	33.3%
St. Mary's	26.7%
Somerset	25.0%
Talbot	50.0%
Washington	15.4%
Wicomico	19.4%
Worcester	45.5%
Out of State	28.6%
<b>Maryland</b>	<b>28.4%</b>

**Table 55: DJS Community-Based Residential Placement – Percent of Children Placed by County of Residence (COR)**

## ***Resource Development***

### **Gaps and needs**

DJS' goal is to achieve a 20% reduction in the community-based population by diverting children through participation in MST and FFT programs. With improved non-residential community supervision services such as probation, community detention, electronic monitoring and Global Positioning System (GPS), DJS also plans to reduce OOH placements. DJS continues to improve case management processes to shorten the waiting time in pending placement to appropriately place children without delaying the interagency approval mechanisms.

**Highlights:**

- DJS reduced community-based placements from 28% in FY08 to 24% in FY10.
- Males accounted for 81% of the placements in FY08 and declined to 72% in FY10.
- Over the past three years, the proportion of African-American children has increased from 69% in FY08 to 76% in FY10. The placements of white children were reduced from 26% to 20%.
- The average age at the time of placement increased from 16.1 in FY08 to 16.4 in FY10.

**Recommendations**

- Continue to reduce DJS' group home population.
- Expand the MST and FFT slots.
- Increase the community services for children placed on probation, community detention, and GPS.

## ***Section V: Non-Community Based Residential Placements***

### **Overview**

This section provides an analysis of the number of placements in Non-Community Based Residential Programs. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding agencies represented in this category. Non-Community Based Residential Programs (NCB) includes the following placements: Residential Treatment Centers; Adult Corrections; Juvenile Detention and Commitment Centers; Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs; Residential Educational Facilities; Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program; and Non-Secure/Non-RTC.

### **Definitions**

**Detention and Commitment Centers:** Detention Centers are secure facilities for pre-treatment of children pending placement. Commitment Centers are secure treatment facilities for children with a broad range of emotional, behavioral and other needs.

**Diagnostic Evaluation Treatment Program:** Short-term care not to exceed ninety (90) days in length that identifies and facilitates diagnostic services for children in need of stabilization before transition into a longer-term placement setting.

**Living Arrangement-Non-Community Based:** Includes juvenile commitment facilities, the adult criminal correctional system and residential juvenile detention and juvenile detention programs.

**Non-Secure/Non-RTC:** These are placements for children whose profile indicates no need for either a secure facility or the intensive psychiatric care provided by a RTC. These facilities are for children with low- to medium- risk security profiles.

**Residential Educational Facilities:** An organized non-public education program of instruction in English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies and other curricular areas provided by a teacher to students enrolled in grades K-12.

**Residential Treatment Centers (RTC):** An RTC refers to a specialized type of facility that offers intensive psychiatric care. RTC facilities must be licensed by the DHMH Office of Health Care Quality and be accredited by the Joint Commission. There is a specified set of psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, and other mental health professionals required to be on staff to meet the RTC licensing requirements as well as a set of quality of care standards for RTC operation.

**Substance Abuse and Addiction Programs:**

- **ASAM Level III.1 (Halfway House)** - Clinically-Managed Low Low-Intensity Residential Treatment
- **ASAM Level III.3 (Long-Term Care)** - Clinically-Managed Medium Medium-Intensity Residential Treatment
- **ASAM Level III.5 (Therapeutic Community)** - Clinically-Managed High High-Intensity Residential Treatment
- **ASAM Level III.7 (Intermediate Care Facility)** - Medically-Monitored Intensive Inpatient Treatment
- **ASAM Level III.7.D** – Medically-Monitored Inpatient Detoxification

**Non-Community-Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010**

Table 56 (page 81) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of OOH placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction that are also placed in that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.

*Non-Community Based Residential Programs: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction*

Non-Community Based Residential Programs, All Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	19	1.2%	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Anne Arundel	106	6.9%	3	48	15	7	1	4	1	4	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1
Baltimore	167	10.9%	1	2	88	28	0	4	9	4	1	2	8	2	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	0
Baltimore City	374	24.3%	4	12	79	203	0	3	11	2	1	3	5	0	2	4	1	4	2	0	3	0	0	7	0	0	22	6
Calvert	25	1.6%	0	1	4	1	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	0
Caroline	17	1.1%	2	0	2	3	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	38	2.5%	4	0	5	3	0	0	16	1	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Cecil	36	2.3%	3	1	7	2	0	1	0	10	1	0	3	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Charles	36	2.3%	1	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0
Dorchester	16	1.0%	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Frederick	68	4.4%	3	0	8	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	41	0	0	1	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Garrett	12	0.8%	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	44	2.9%	0	2	8	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	0	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Howard	36	2.3%	1	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kent	9	0.6%	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Montgomery	181	11.8%	4	0	14	12	0	6	1	2	0	1	16	1	2	2	0	108	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	0
Prince George's	172	11.2%	1	3	30	11	0	2	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	2	1	9	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1
Queen Anne's	10	0.7%	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	9	0.6%	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	21	1.4%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	0
Talbot	12	0.8%	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	50	3.3%	2	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	3	0
Wicomico	30	2.0%	1	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Worcester	13	0.8%	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0
OOS	37	2.4%	0	4	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	8	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1538	100.0%	49	80	304	300	10	35	42	27	18	27	130	10	28	27	7	147	96	2	6	16	2	39	16	9	103	8
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in			31.6%	45.3%	52.7%	54.3%	36.0%	41.2%	42.1%	27.8%	33.3%	37.5%	60.3%	41.7%	31.8%	33.3%	0.0%	59.7%	49.4%	20.0%	33.3%	57.1%	16.7%	58.0%	46.7%	69.2%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			3.2%	5.2%	19.8%	19.5%	0.7%	2.3%	2.7%	1.8%	1.2%	1.8%	8.5%	0.7%	1.8%	1.8%	0.5%	9.6%	6.2%	0.1%	0.4%	1.0%	0.1%	2.5%	1.0%	0.6%	6.7%	0.5%

Table 56: Non-Community Based Residential Placements on January 31, 2010

## Non-Community Based Residential Programs Statewide Summary

There were 1,538 children in Non-Community-Based Residential placements on the single-day count. 36.7% of Non-Community-Based Residential Placements were made by DJS and DHR placed 22% of the children in Non-Community-Based Residential placements.




Figure 17: # of Children in Non-Community-Based Residential Placements, by Placing and/or Funding Agency

### *Non-Community-Based Residential Placements by Type Across Agencies*

Non-Community-Based Residential Placements include diagnostic evaluation treatment programs (DETP); long-term and short-term substance abuse programs (ASAM); detention/commitment facilities (D/C); Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs); Non-Secure/Non-RTC, and residential educational facilities (REFs).




Figure 18: Non-Community-Based Residential Placements by Type

# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE

## ALCOHOL AND DRUG AND ABUSE ADMINISTRATION

### (ADAA)

OOH placement for alcohol and drug abuse treatment in Maryland takes place at four American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) levels of care: Level III.1 (clinically-managed low-intensity residential); Level III.3 (clinically-managed medium-intensity residential); Level III.5 (clinically-managed high-intensity residential); Level III.7 (medically-monitored inpatient); and, Level III.7.D (medically-monitored inpatient-detoxification).

From FY08 to FY10, enrollments of patients aged 21 or younger in Maryland residential alcohol and drug abuse treatment increased by 22%. The bulk of the increase is in Level III.7.D, which has a very high patient-turnover rate. The length of stay in III.7.D is typically a week or and the majority of these stays are followed immediately by treatment in Level III.7. The overall increase in enrollments was driven largely by a 58.6% increase in enrollments involving heroin, a 149.1% increase in cases involving oxycodone and other opiates, and a 111.1% increase in cases involving benzodiazepines. Over two-thirds of the enrollments involved marijuana during all three years. The opiate and benzodiazepine figures are reflective of a State and national trend toward greater abuse of prescription drugs. Table 57 presents the substance problems reported for relevant enrollments over the three years.

Substance Problems Reported for Out-of-Home Placement Enrollments of Patients Aged 21 and Under in Maryland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment						
Reported Substance Problems*	Fiscal Year of Enrollment					
	2008		2009		2010	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	993	42.5	1069	42.9	1140	39.8
Crack	257	11.0	181	7.3	229	8.0
Other Cocaine	283	12.1	198	8.0	248	8.7
Marijuana/Hashish	1681	71.9	1815	72.9	1958	68.4
Heroin	543	23.2	617	24.8	861	30.1
Non-Rx Methadone	27	1.2	36	1.4	21	0.7
Oxycodone	333	14.2	461	18.5	865	30.2
Other Opiates	95	4.1	116	4.7	201	7.0
PCP	57	2.4	82	3.3	82	2.9
Hallucinogens	70	3.0	64	2.6	33	1.2
Methamphetamines	5	0.2	19	0.8	20	0.7
Other Amphetamines	72	3.1	57	2.3	39	1.4
Stimulants	5	0.2	5	0.2	1	0.0
Benzodiazepines	135	5.8	128	5.1	285	10.0
Other Tranquilizers	1	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0
Barbiturates	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0
Other Sedatives or Hypnotics	5	0.2	5	0.2	1	0.0
Inhalants	9	0.4	3	0.1	6	0.2
Over-the-Counter	15	0.6	17	0.7	16	0.6
Other	108	4.6	56	2.2	64	2.2
<b>Enrollments</b>	<b>2339</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>2490</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>2864</b>	<b>—</b>
*Up to three substance problems may be reported for each enrollment so columns do not sum to total enrollments.						

**Table 57: Substance Problems for OOH Enrollment by reported substance abuse problem**


The majority of the relevant placements in residential alcohol and drug abuse treatment programs were voluntary: only 21% of the placements in FY10 were from the criminal justice system, and this is trending downward. Table 58 distributes enrollments by source of referral.

<b>Substance Problems Reported for Out-of-Home Placement Enrollments of Patients Aged 21 and Under in Maryland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment</b>						
<b>Source of Referral</b>	<b>Fiscal Year of Enrollment</b>					
	<b>2008</b>		<b>2009</b>		<b>2010</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Juvenile Justice	388	16.6	354	14.2	358	12.5
TASC	1	0.0	5	0.2	8	0.3
DWI/DUI Related	8	0.3	12	0.5	8	0.3
Pre-Trial	12	0.5	11	0.4	18	0.6
Probation	35	1.5	16	0.6	10	0.3
Parole	1	0.0	3	0.1	3	0.1
State Prison	13	0.6	33	1.3	52	1.8
Local Detention	49	2.1	30	1.2	37	1.3
DHMH Court Commitment	18	0.8	22	0.9	26	0.9
Drug Court	54	2.3	35	1.4	35	1.2
Other Criminal Justice	34	1.5	30	1.2	46	1.6
Individual (Self-Referral)	351	15.0	462	18.6	595	20.8
Parent/Gaurdian/Family	214	9.1	232	9.3	334	11.7
Alcohol/Drug Abuse Care Provider	472	20.1	511	20.5	648	22.6
Other Health Care Provider	188	8.0	241	9.7	319	11.1
School/Student Assistance Program	6	0.3	8	0.3	2	0.1
Employer/EAP	10	0.4	2	0.1	3	0.1
DSS/TCA	24	1.0	3	0.1	16	0.6
Other Community Referral	412	17.6	447	18.0	321	11.2
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration	53	2.3	31	1.2	27	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>2343</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2488</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2866</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 58: Substance Problems for OOHP Enrollments by Referral Source**

Just under one-third of FY10 enrollments were self or parental referrals, an increase of referrals from 24% in FY08. Also increasing were referrals from other substance abuse treatment and healthcare providers. This was associated with greater emphasis by ADAA on continuing care, recovery and general health. Also, Figure 19, page 85, shows that the percentages of enrollments with injecting drug use, mental health issues, multiple substance problems and cigarette smoking have increased over the three years while those reported as being in school, vocational training and/or employed have declined. About 45% of the enrollments with multiple substance problems involved dual abuse of marijuana and alcohol. Less than 1% of enrollments were pregnant during any of the three years.





**Figure 19: Percentages of OOHP in Maryland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment**

The one-day count of patients increased by 42%. However it is important to note that half of the active residential patients on January 31, 2010 were in Level III.7, which typically lasts less than 30 days. Only about 30% of the applicable patients remained in Level III.7 longer than 30 days.

In the planned continuum of care, treatment in Level III.7 is followed by treatment in Level I Outpatient. ADAA routinely monitors program performance measures based on the percentages of patients who complete Levels III.7 and III.7.D and enter the next level of care within thirty days. During 2010, 78% of age 21 and under patients disenrolled from State-funded Level III.7.D and 32% from III.7 entered another level of care within thirty days. Table 59, page 86, illustrates the mean and median lengths of stay for the relevant patients in the residential categories of treatment during FY08, FY09 and FY10.

<b>Length of Stay (Days) for Enrollment of Patients Aged 21 and Under in Maryland Residential Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment</b>					
<b>Level of Care</b>	<b>Fiscal Year of Disenrollment</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Median</b>
Level III.1	2008	95	70.12	68.830	37.0
	2009	126	75.03	70.178	43.0
	2010	113	68.58	59.930	41.0
Level III.3	2008	171	64.36	47.284	56.0
	2009	155	69.85	51.136	61.0
	2010	156	62.63	54.258	34.5
Level III.5	2008	102	89.34	56.180	89.0
	2009	146	101.45	66.057	103.5
	2010	134	118.28	59.650	139.0
Level III.7	2008	1623	27.02	23.176	22.0
	2009	1592	26.45	20.500	21.0
	2010	1567	25.12	21.909	19.0
Level III.7.D	2008	338	4.83	3.705	4.0
	2009	454	5.61	4.452	5.0
	2010	852	8.80	9.668	5.0

**Table 59: Length of Stay (Days) for Enrollment of Patients Aged 21 and Under in Maryland Residential Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment.**

The mean length of stay in Level III.7 declined by nearly two days over the three years, contributing to the increase in enrollments. Also, the total State-funded treatment beds for III.7 in FY10 represent an 8.4% increase over the FY08 total. On the other hand, the State-funded beds for longer-term residential treatment, III.1 (425), III.3 (279), and III.5 (329) were reduced by about 9% from the FY08 levels. This resulted in an overall 5% reduction in funded. Despite this the one-day count increased by 42 % over the three years. This can be partially attributed to increased capacity in the non-funded sector and partially to the perennial problem of late-submitted patient discharges.

### ***Resource Development***

#### **Gaps and Needs**

For adolescent patients (under age 18) there is frequently a gap in the transition from Level III.7 to the home community. As previously noted, Level III.7 has an average length of stay of less than thirty days. In many cases this is insufficient to establish the attitudes and behavioral changes necessary to resist the negative influences and pressures experienced in the home community. The data show that only about a third of the patients who leave III.7 continue

treatment in a less restrictive level of care. More access for children to transitional halfway-house types of programs is a significant need.

For young adults (18 to 21), there is a need for more recovery housing and recovery dormitories to support positive and healthy lifestyles. These young people are typically placed in residential settings that house adult patients of all ages, but their needs tend to be somewhat different and more specialized programming would be a plus. Also with the increasing incidence and recognition of mental health issues in this population, it will be crucial to ensure that appropriate therapies are available. The growing numbers of these patients with problems with prescription painkillers require more access to effective medications like buprenorphine.

### **Data Highlights**

- Increasing placements were driven largely by increases in patients abusing prescription opiates and sedatives.
- Fewer placements were referred from the juvenile justice system while self/family referrals increased dramatically.
- Increasing percentages of patients had mental health problems, were injecting drug users, had multiple substance problems, were tobacco users, and were less likely to be involved in school or employment.
- The great majority of placements were to Level III.7 and III.7.D, short-term partial hospitalization.

### **Recommendation**

Attention should be given to establishing alternatives for placement of young adult patients after completion of Level III.7 and strengthening the connection to intensive outpatient treatment and primary care physicians in the home communities.

## **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE MENTAL HYGIENE ADMINISTRATION (MHA)**

MHA only makes OOH placements at the Non-Community Residential level of care. These placements are made solely in psychiatric Residential Treatment Centers (RTCs.) Although MHA offers psychiatric hospitalization as a part of its benefit package, hospitalization is considered by MHA as a treatment episode and not an OOH placement because hospital stays are overwhelmingly short-term and most children return to their homes after a short stay. MHA directly operates RTCs and also purchases RTC placements from the private sector. MHA is currently in the process of analyzing data on the utilization of private sector RTC beds for the past year. This analysis has been slightly delayed compared to prior years' reports because of the transition of vendors for the ASO that authorizes and pays claims on behalf of MHA. This delay will require the submission of an addendum to this report by MHA when the data has been validated and analysis completed. In the interim, MHA has provided data from the publicly operated RTCs - the Regional Institutes for Children and Adolescents (RICAs.) MHA will return to the more comprehensive reporting format for both public and private sector placements seen in past years once the addendum is submitted.

During the three three-year period covered by this report, a number of important developments must be considered with regard to RICA utilization. Perhaps the greatest of these is the closure by legislative action of RICA-Southern in Cheltenham, Maryland, which was effective at the end of FY08. The effect of this closure can be seen in the beginning and end-of -year data reported for FY08. A related development, only slightly less substantive, is that the two RICAs remaining after the above above-referenced closure, one located in Montgomery County and the other in Baltimore County, sustained significant budget reductions and corresponding downsizing of capacity as a result of the State's ongoing fiscal problems during the reporting period. An executive decision at DHMH reflects a consistent policy applied by MHA across all service sectors: to close and downsize State-operated facilities and preserve, to the extent possible, the community-based system of care. MHA supports the continued operation of the two public RTCs at their current capacity. The effects of this previous budget reduction can be seen in the beginning and end of year data for FY10.

A final major development to be considered within the overall analysis of RTC bed need is the implementation of the RTC Medicaid Section 1915(c) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility Demonstration Waiver (RTC Waiver), a special demonstration project of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) that provides a set of specialized services and care management that can serve as a community community-based alternative to placement in an RTC. As enrollments in the RTC Waiver increase, a corresponding reduction in the need for RTC placements will naturally occur. At the time of this report, approximately 100 children were enrolled in the RTC Waiver.

It is important to note that as a result of these and many other contributing factors, MHA was tasked by the Legislature to submit a separate Joint Chairman's Report (JCR) concerning the

utilization of RTCs in public and private sectors and to determine the optimum capacity for RTC placements and community alternatives to such placements in the Maryland.

### ***Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of RICA Placements***

<b><i>Population Flow – Non-Community Based ( RICAs only)</i></b>				
<b>State Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Placements at Start of FY</b>	<b>Admissions during FY</b>	<b>Discharges during FY</b>	<b>Placements at End of FY</b>
FY08	123	138	176	85
FY09	84	131	121	94
FY10	93	88	117	64
Change from FY08	-24%	-36%	-34%	-25%
Average Yearly Change	-10%	-19%	-17%	-11%
Recent Year Change	+11%	-33%	-3%	-32%

**Table 60: MHA Population Flow – Non-Community Based (RICAs only)**

The data in the first and last columns are an unduplicated count of the numbers of children and children in placement at the start and end of each fiscal year. However, the data presented in the middle columns on admissions and discharges during each of the fiscal years may have duplicate counts. This is because a particular child may have been discharged and readmitted during the year to the same or a different RICA. For example, a child might be hospitalized for a short period of time, discharged from the RICA and then returned to the same or another RICA to be readmitted after the hospitalization and thus counted as a separate discrete admission.

As noted above, the overall pattern of decreased utilization is attributable to closure of a facility and ongoing downsizing efforts within the remaining facilities.

## Gender, Race and Age

### Gender

<i>MHA Non-Community Based (RICAs only) – Number of Placements by Gender</i>			
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female	Not Determined
FY08	184	76	1
FY09	134	79	1
FY10	112	66	3

**Table 61: MHA Non-Community Based (RICAs only) –Number of Placements by Gender**

Patterns of over-representation of adolescent males placed in RTCs continued during the reporting period. The percentage ranged between 70% and 62%, recorded in FY08 and FY10 respectively. This may be suggestive of an increasing rate of more serious disorders in adolescent females reflected elsewhere within the child and adolescent service system.

### Race

<i>MHA Non-Community-Based Residential Placements (RICAs only) – Number of Placements by Race</i>									
Fiscal Year	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Bi-Racial/ Multiple Races Identified	Other	Data Unavailable	Total
<b>FY08</b>	2	2	136	0	103	0	18	0	261
<b>FY09</b>	2	3	106	0	92	0	11	0	214
<b>FY10</b>	1	3	83	0	79	0	15	0	181

**Table 62: MHA Non-Community-Based Residential Placements (RICAs only) – Number of Placements by Race**

Historic patterns of over-representation of African-American children in RTC placements continued during the reporting period, trending slightly downward from 52% in FY08 to 46% in FY10.

## Age

<i>January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in MHA Non-Community Based Placements (RICAs)</i>		
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
11 - 15	34	49
16 - 20	35	51
<b>Total</b>	69	100

**Table 63: January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in MHA Non-Community Based Placements (RICAs)**

The RICAs serve a largely adolescent-age group that is split virtually evenly between younger and older adolescent groups. Younger children who may need RTC placement are typically placed in specialized private programs that are geared to meet their individualized special needs.

## *Analysis for Cost*

<i>MHA FY10 Costs for RICAs</i>			
<b>Categories</b>	<b>Number of Beds Days Funded FY10</b>	<b>Placement Costs FY10</b>	<b>Educational Cost FY10</b>
Non- Community-Based Residential Placement (RICAs Only)	28,309	\$15,228,053	See note below

**Table 64: MHA FY10 Costs for RICAs**

Educational costs in RICAs are a complex mix of State and Local School System (LSS) funding. The educational programs at the two RICAs are operated and financed in basically different ways. In Baltimore, the program is a State-operated program which has a mix of funding from DHMH, MSDE, and LSSs or other State agencies placing youth in the residential program. In Montgomery County, the program is locally operated by the Montgomery County Public School System, which serves youth from Montgomery County who are placed at the facility and handles

the billing of educational costs for other youth from outside the county to various State and local sources as appropriate.

## ***Resource Development***

### **Gaps and needs**

- There is a need to reduce RTC beds and replace them with community alternatives. One way to achieve this is to fund additional slots in the RTC Waiver and other community-based services.
- For children who may require an OOH placement, there is a need for additional high-quality, stable settings where children may reside while they receive specialized treatment for their psychiatric disorders.
- Data were obtained from the RTCs on the vacancy rates for general beds as well as beds specifically reserved for children who are court-involved, have co-occurring disorders, or who are adjudicated as sex offenders. The FY11 estimate for overall bed need closely approximates the current vacancy rates in the RTCs, which has been consistently declining for the past few years. The estimates for the specialized beds were based on the average daily populations in the specialized beds, as reported by the RTCs. Since the RTC Waiver (Maryland's 1915(c) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility Demonstration Waiver, the primary source of RTC-diversion programming) has been operating for approximately one year, the initial impact of the RTC Waiver has already been incorporated into vacancy rates. Data were also obtained on the children who were placed OOS in RTCs that receive Maryland Medicaid reimbursement, and these children were factored into the projections in terms of the beds needed to return them to Maryland.
- The estimates for FY12 and FY13 build on the estimates for FY11. However, they also factor in shorter lengths of stay and increased availability of the RTC Waiver. The average length of stay has been decreasing and is expected to decrease over the next several years as MHA implements a policy of utilizing RTCs for short-term placements primarily for diagnostic and evaluative purposes. It is expected that the average length of stay in RTCs will decrease from its current length of over one year to an average of six months. This will enable the RTCs to serve more children with fewer beds.
- In FY11, the RTC Waiver is funded to support approximately 210 children. If funding were increased for the RTC Waiver, additional children could be served.
- The FY12 projections assume approximately 400 RTC Waiver slots and a reduced average length of stay in the RTC to six months. The FY13 projections assume approximately 500 RTC Waiver slots and an average length of stay of six months in the RTC.
- The final factor that was incorporated into the reduction in bed need by specialization was the expectation that through the CMEs and the RTC Waiver, communities will become increasingly open to serving children who are court-involved, have co-occurring



disorders, or are sex offenders. This is based on the experience of other jurisdictions outside of Maryland who are successful in safely and effectively serving these populations in their homes and communities, including Wraparound Milwaukee which currently serves 89% of the juveniles in their program who are adjudicated as sex offenders in community settings. However, the figures for the beds serving children who are adjudicated as sex offenders were held steady for FY11 and FY12. This was done to provide time for training and education of the juvenile services and child welfare workforce, the judiciary, and attorneys on the ability to safely serve children who are adjudicated as sex offenders in the community with the necessary services and supports.

- DHMH will work in partnership with the RTCs to de-license beds that are not being used. As the beds are de-licensed, DHMH will encourage its sister Agencies in the Children's Cabinet to explore opportunities to contract with the RTCs to use the de-licensed beds to serve children who are currently placed OOS in non-RTC placements. Simultaneously, DHMH plans to shift the funds that are currently allocated for RTC beds to serve as matching funds for the RTC Waiver, allowing for an increase in RTC Waiver utilization, particularly as the cost for the RTC Waiver is significantly less than the cost for RTCs. Some of the funds that were used for RTC beds may be used to assist in the development of a comprehensive continuum of community-based services that are necessary to support the RTC Waiver in all jurisdictions. DHMH will continue to monitor the effectiveness of the RTC Waiver and support legislative efforts to extend and support the RTC Waiver on a national level, and will adjust its plan regarding RTC and RTC Waiver capacity accordingly.

### **Summary**

The JCR requires DHMH to estimate future RTC bed need. Currently there are slightly over 100 beds vacant in private RTCs. This vacancy rate has been growing over the last two years. The bed estimate for the next year is based on this vacancy rate plus the current number of community-based RTC Waiver slots (approximately 200), plus the current average length of stay in RTCs of about one year. If DHMH was able to reduce length of stay to six months and increase RTC Waiver slots to 500 by reallocating RTC funds from future RTC bed closures to fund more RTC Waiver slots, we estimated need for about 250 RTC beds in three years. This estimate is predicated on these changes. It is DHMH's intent to utilize our funding to increase home and community based services for children and their families and reduce a reliance on the utilization of RTC beds. Interagency groups have been discussing this with the RTC providers for at least five years and have been encouraging providers to work with us and participate in the development of more home and community based services.

## DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)

### *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements*

Non-community based placements comprise approximately 4% or fewer of all DHR out-of-home placements (Table 9, page 28), and placements have declined slightly over the past three fiscal years, but not at rate as high as family foster homes or community-based placements. The number of children in non-community based placements at the end of the fiscal year has decreased 3% from FY08 to FY10, with a 14% decrease from FY09 to FY10 (Table 65).

<i>Population Flow – Non-Community Based (count of placements, not children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY	Ends in FY	Placements at End of FY
FY08	230	326	247	309
FY09	309	397	356	350
FY10	350	422	471	301
Change from FY08	52%	29%	91%	-3%
Average Yearly Change	23%	14%	38%	-1%
Recent Year Change	13%	6%	32%	-14%

**Table 65: DHR Population Flow – Non-Community Based**

Since children placed by DHR in non-community based placements are primarily in either DJS detention facilities or RTCs, DHR has less opportunity to affect a significant reduction in these types of placements as in the previous two placement categories: children co-committed to DJS and DHR placed in DJS detention facilities are ordered into such placements by a judge or master in the juvenile court system, and children are only placed in RTCs when they have severe mental health disorders and symptoms which can often cannot be treated in less restrictive settings.

### *In- State & Out-Of-State (OOS)*

Very few children placed in non-community based placements are placed in OOS facilities. On January 31, 2010, only 2.7% of all such placements were OOS, and these were all secure detention facilities (Table 66, page 95). Children placed in secure detention facilities are co-committed to DJS due to delinquent/criminal activities, and are court-ordered to be placed in a secure facility; DJS is responsible for determining the appropriate placement for these children.

<i>January 31, 2010 – Non-Community-Based OOS Placements</i>				
Category	OOS	Total	Percent of Category	Percent of all Non-Community Based OOS
Secure Detention Facility	9	100	9%	100%
Residential Treatment Centers	0	239	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	9	339	2.7%	100%

**Table 66: DHR Non-Community Based OOS Placements on January 31, 2010**

### ***Gender, Race and Age***

#### **Gender**

As the level of placement category has increased in intensity and restrictiveness, the gap between the percentage of males and females has increased, with males comprising the larger percentage of the population than females. Based on three year averages, the three-year data for non-community based placements show that males typically comprise 62% of the population, with females accounting for 38% of the populations. The gap between males and females, however, appears to be decreasing. (Table 67)

<i>DHR Non-Community Based – Percent of Placements by Gender</i>		
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female
FY08	63%	37%
FY09	62%	38%
FY10	60%	40%

**Table 67: DHR Non-Community Based – Percent of Placements by Gender**

#### **Race**

As with family foster homes and community-based placements, the racial breakdown of children placed in non-community-based residential placements shows that approximately two-thirds of children are black/African-American, although the three-year average is at 66%, slightly lower than for family home settings and community based placements. The three-year average for

whites, correspondingly, is larger than in previous categories, at 29%. All other racial groups comprise less than 5% each of the total non-community-based population. (Table 68)

<b><i>DHR Non-Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Placements by Race</i></b>									
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Bi-Racial/Multiple Races Identified</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Data Unavailable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>FY08</b>	0.0%	0.0%	65.5%	*	27.7%	4.7%	*	1.4%	100.0%
<b>FY09</b>	*	*	67.1%	*	26.5%	5.0%	*	*	100.0%
<b>FY10</b>	*	*	64.0%	0.0%	31.6%	3.8%	0.0%	*	100.0%

*\*Due to the scale of numbers, data on children in these categories cannot be presented.<sup>18</sup>*

**Table 68: DHR Non-Community-Based Residential Placements – Percent of Placements by Race**

### **Age**

Of all children placed in non-community-based placements, 96.8% are over the age of 10. The majority (60.2%) are between ages 16 and 20. No children under the age of 6 are placed in non-community-based placements (Table 69).

<b><i>January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in DHR Non-Community Based Placements</i></b>		
<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Under 6 <sup>19</sup>	0	0%
6 - 10	11	3.2%
11 - 15	124	36.6%
16 - 20	204	60.2%
<b>Total</b>	339	100.0%

**Table 69: January 31, 2010 – Age Groups of Children in DHR Non-Community Based Placements**

<sup>18</sup> When aggregate data show only a small number of children in any one category, confidentiality may be compromised, and so this data is suppressed.

<sup>19</sup> When aggregate data show only a small number of children in any one category, confidentiality may be compromised, and so this data is suppressed.

## *Analysis of Costs*

All non-community based placement costs were incurred for OOS placements, primarily for children co-committed to DJS and court-ordered to DJS detention facilities. Non-community-based placement and education costs represent 0.2% of all DHR out-of-home costs.

<b><i>DHR FY10 Costs by Placement Category</i></b>			
<b>Categories</b>	<b>Number of Bed Days Funded in FY10</b>	<b>Placement Costs FY10</b>	<b>Educational Cost FY10</b>
All placement payments	Not Applicable	\$250,702,227	\$9,134,127
Non-Community-Based (NCB) Residential Placement	2593	\$518,860	\$19,961
Percent (NCB/All)		0.2%	0.2%

**Table 70: DHR FY10 Costs by Placement Category**

## *Resource Development*

### **Gaps and needs**

There is a need for increased RTC services for children ages 5 to 14 and over the age of 16, especially for those exiting a psychiatric hospitalization.

### **Data Highlights**

- Non-community based placements comprise approximately 4% or fewer of all DHR OOH placements.
- The number of non-community-based residential placements has declined slightly (by 3%) over the past three fiscal years.
- Children in non-community-based placements are in either DJS court-ordered detention facilities or medically-needed residential treatment centers.
- Fewer than 3% of all DHR children in non-community-based placements are placed OOS.
- Among non-community-based placements, 62% of children are male and 38% are female.
- Of children in non-community-based placements, 66% are black/African-American and 29% are white.
- Of the majority of children in non-community-based placements, 60% are ages 16 to 20 with 37% ages 11 to 15.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)

### *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements*

Non-community based placements comprise approximately 66% of all DJS out-of-home placements (Table 16, page 35), and increased 3% from 63% in FY08 to 66% in FY10. The number of children in non-community based placements at the end of the fiscal year has remained the same from FY08 to FY10, with a 9% increase from FY09 to FY10 (Table 71).

<i>Population Flow – Non-Community Based Residential Placement (count of placements or children)</i>				
State Fiscal Year	Placements at Start of FY	Starts in FY	Ends in FY	Placements at End of FY
FY08	554	1356	1330	579
FY09	579	1336	1380	532
FY10	532	1381	1330	579
Change from FY08	-4%	2%	0%	0%
Average Yearly Change	-2%	1%	0%	0%
Recent Year Change	-8%	3%	-4%	9%

**Table 71: DJS Population Flow – Non-Community Based Residential Placement**

### *Gender, Race and Age*

#### Gender

The proportion of male and female remained about the same from FY09 to FY10 with 90% male and 10% female (Table 72).

<i>DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Gender</i>		
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female
FY08	91%	9%
FY09	90%	10%
FY10	90%	10%

**Table 72: DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Gender**

## Race

Over the past three years, African-American children population increased from 63% in FY08 to 70% in FY10 and white children decreased from 30% in FY08 to 25% in FY10 (Table 73).

<i>DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Race</i>									
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>American Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Bi-Racial/ Multiple Races Identified</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Data Unavailable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>FY08</b>	0.1%	0.7%	62.9%	0.2%	30.4%	0.2%	4.8%	0.7%	100.0%
<b>FY09</b>	0.2%	0.5%	63.7%	0.1%	30.8%	0.1%	4.5%	0.3%	100.0%
<b>FY10</b>	0.1%	0.3%	70.1%	0.0%	25.1%	0.1%	3.7%	0.7%	100.0%

**Table 73: DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Race**

## Age

The median age was 16.7 in both FY09 and FY10 (Table 74).

<i>DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Age</i>							
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>11-13</b>	<b>14-16</b>	<b>17-18</b>	<b>Over 18</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Median Age</b>	<b>Average Age</b>
<b>FY08</b>	3%	53%	44%	1%	1910	16.6	16.5
<b>FY09</b>	2%	51%	46%	1%	1915	16.7	16.6
<b>FY10</b>	2%	52%	45%	1%	1915	16.7	16.6

**Table 74: DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Placements by Age**

Table 75, page 100, shows the percentage of children placed by their County of residence (COR) as of January 31, 2010 in Non-Community Based Residential placements out of the total population of OOH placements. For example, on January 31, 2010 57.7% of the children in OOH Placements from Baltimore City were placed by the DJS in Non-Community Based Residential placements.

<b><i>DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Children Placed by COR</i></b>	
<b>COR</b>	<b>1/31/2010</b>
Allegany	37.5%
Anne Arundel	63.6%
Baltimore City	57.7%
Baltimore County	67.1%
Calvert	53.3%
Caroline	75.0%
Carroll	73.7%
Cecil	71.4%
Charles	50.0%
Dorchester	66.7%
Frederick	78.8%
Garrett	66.7%
Harford	70.6%
Howard	75.0%
Kent	0.0%
Montgomery	67.4%
Prince George's	56.4%
Queen Anne's	22.2%
St. Mary's	66.7%
Somerset	75.0%
Talbot	50.0%
Washington	71.8%
Wicomico	45.2%
Worcester	40.9%
Out of State	64.3%
<b>Maryland</b>	<b>60.6%</b>

**Table 75: DJS Non-Community Based Residential Placement – Percent of Children Placed by COR**



## **Data Highlights**

- Non-community based placements account for two-thirds (66%) of DJS' committed OOH placements.
- Over the past three years, the proportion of placements by gender remained the same with 90% male.
- Comparison of data by race shows that African-American placements increased from 63% in FY08 to 70% in FY10. Conversely, during the same period, the placement of Whites the White race group decreased from 30% to 25%.
- The average age at admission increased from 16.5 in FY08 to 16.6 in both FY09 and FY10.

## ***Resource Development***

### **Gaps and needs**

The increase in non-community based residential placement from FY09 to FY10 has several reasons. After the closure of Hickey program in 2005, DJS' pending placement numbers swelled. Over the years, DJS has reduced the lengthy processing time of interagency approval mechanisms, slowly closing the gap of pending children which has partly resulted in an increase in community based residential placement. All OOS placements fall under this category and DJS's goal is to serve children in Maryland. DJS reopened Victor Cullen in FY09. In addition to these efforts, the development and implementation of the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Planning (MCASP) has resulted in the identification of services based on a child's risk score and needs. MCASP risk and needs assessment scores have allowed DJS workers to identify children at high-risk levels or above and process their cases to meet their service needs. As a result of this tool, some children have been moved from less restrictive environments to secure programs. DJS plans to have two additional commitment facilities, one for male and one for female children.

## **Recommendations**


- Continue to place children in Maryland.
- Continue to validate the MCASP tool and place children in appropriate placement.
- Reduce the number of children returning to DJS or adult system.

## MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (MSDE)

In accordance with § 8-415 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, MSDE co-funds OOH educational placements made by a LSS as necessary to meet a student's Individualized Education Program (IEP). MSDE does not determine the need for the OOH educational placement nor set the parameters used by the IEP Team in determining the educational need for placement. The IEP Team at the LSS is responsible for selecting the Nonpublic Special Education School that will provide the appropriate services to the student. The placement of a student into a nonpublic, OOH educational placement is an individual decision made by the student's IEP team. A decision to place a student into such a placement is made when the LSS determines it is unable to appropriately meet the student's educational needs.

### *Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements*

During FY10, 19 of Maryland's 24 LSSs co-funded with MSDE residential nonpublic placements for their students. In FY08 the number of children provided special education services in residential placements funded by the MSDE/LSS was steadily declining from previous years. In FY09 the number of placements rose to 303 with a decrease in FY10 to 286. This represents a 14% increase from FY08 to FY10. Many of the students requiring a residential nonpublic placement through the IEP Team process are diagnosed with Autism. The Medicaid Home and Community Based Services Waiver for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (Autism Waiver) is designed to provide in home interventions to facilitate children remaining in a community placement. Parents of children receiving waiver services may choose a residential component when appropriate for the child. In FY10 there were 31 children receiving Autism Waiver services in residential settings.



**Figure 20: MSDE Residential Education Facility Trends**

### ***Three-Year Trend Analysis for Cost***

The total cost in FY08 was \$18.7 million. The cost for residential nonpublic placements for FY10 was \$21.5 million, an increase of 14.97%. The cost for children served through the Autism Waiver was \$1.4 million for the State and an additional \$1.1 in federal dollars.

### ***Maryland School for the Blind & Maryland School for the Deaf***

#### ***Overview***

In accordance with § 8-303 of the Annotated Code of Maryland, MSDE, each County Board of Education, the Maryland School for the Deaf and the Maryland School for the Blind shall work together to meet the educational needs of deaf and blind children.

#### **The Maryland School for the Deaf**

The Maryland School for the Deaf (MSD) is established under §8-304 of the Annotated Code of Maryland. MSD is required to admit free of charge all students who are Maryland residents and meet the established admissions criteria. Section 8-305 requires each local education agency to notify the parents or guardians of each hearing impaired child of the availability of the educational programs offered by MSD. Funding for MSD is established under §8-310.3. The MSD is also required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services for deaf students who have other moderate to severe disabilities under § 8-310.1 with funding provided jointly by the State and the County. The majority of students who are enrolled at MSD are placed by parents or guardians and are not placed by a LSS. Children receiving enhanced services<sup>20</sup> are placed by LSSs through the IEP Team process. A small number of enrolled students live on campus weeknights during the school year (late August through early June).

	<b>Total Residential Served</b>	<b>Residential Cost</b>	<b>Educational Cost</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
<b>FY08</b>	76 <sup>21</sup>	\$2,180,140	\$3,382,102	\$5,562,242
<b>FY09</b>	129	\$2,335,339	\$5,931,494	\$8,266,833
<b>FY10</b>	125	\$2,296,579	\$5,893,239	\$8,189,818

**Table 76: MD School for the Deaf Placement Costs**

<sup>20</sup> Enhanced services allow students to receive educational services in Maryland rather in an OOS residential program.

<sup>21</sup> \*Enrollment counts for FY08 for residential students were not calculated consistently with previous or future school years.

## **The Maryland School for the Blind**

The Maryland School for the Blind (MSB) is established to provide services for children placed by LSSs through the IEP Team process. In accordance with § 8-307.1 each local education agency in the State shall notify the parents or guardians of each blind or visually impaired child, including children with multiple disabilities, of the availability of the educational programs and administrative policies of the schools under their jurisdiction. The MSB is also required to establish and operate a program of enhanced services<sup>22</sup> for blind students who have other disabilities with funding provided jointly by the State and County. The budget for MSB is submitted annually by the Governor to the General Assembly. The residential program offers a continuum of service options. Students may participate in the program on an extended day, part part-time or full full-time and may reside in a dormitory apartment.

	<b>Total Residential Served</b>	<b>Residential Cost</b>	<b>Educational Cost</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
<b>FY08</b>	105	\$3,436,180	\$11,512,300	\$14,948,480
<b>FY09</b>	99	\$3,937,636	\$10,669,824	\$14,607,450
<b>FY10</b>	90	\$5,022,582	\$9,910,710	\$14,933,292

**Table 77: MD School for the Blind Placement Costs**

## ***Resource Development***

MSDE is not a placing agency - the IEP Team which includes the parent/guardian makes the placement decisions. The LSSs work with providers to ensure that students with IEPs are provided services in the least restrictive environment.

## ***Agency Initiatives***

### **A Public/Private Partnership**

A Public/Private Partnership (P/PP) is a funding agreement between a Local School System (LSS) and a Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) -approved Nonpublic Special Education Program for the purpose of serving students as an enhancement to the individual student application process of the MSDE Nonpublic Tuition Assistance Program (NTAP). The P/PP is not intended to replace the traditional NTAP process. A P/PP supports inclusion and facilitates the provision of a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Regardless of the number of different students enrolled within a fiscal year, payment is

---

<sup>22</sup> Note – Enhanced services allow students to receive educational services in Maryland rather in an OOS residential program.

based upon the tuition for a specified number of full-time equivalency (FTE) students. The enhanced flexibility in funding through a P/PP supports short-term placements and the transitioning of students to a LRE when they are ready.

### **Supports Available to Children in OOH Placements**

There are currently 286 children with disabilities in Maryland being educated in OOH placements. These children often have complex disabilities, with implications for an array of social, language, educational, sensory, behavioral, and medical difficulties. The number of students with disabilities provided with special education services in residential placements has fluctuated throughout the previous two fiscal years. The data demonstrate a 14% increase in OOH placements from FY08 to FY10.

The parents, family members, caregivers, educators and health care professionals who serve children with disabilities are in constant pursuit of information and resources to assist in meeting the unique needs of these children in order to promote their independence and support their development.

The MSDE Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services is dedicated to providing supports to families and professionals that serve children with disabilities, in order to maintain these children in their least restrictive environment and provide the necessary services in the community to divert students with significant disabilities from OOH placements.

The MSDE is collaborating with local programs and interagency partners on a number of initiatives to increase the awareness of, information about, and support for individuals with Autism and Emotional Disabilities (two of the largest disability subgroups represented in OOH placements), as well as efforts to develop core competencies, strategies, and recommendations for improving and increasing the capacity of the mental health workforce throughout the State.

An overview of the programs, partnerships, and initiatives that MSDE is engaged in to improve outcomes for children and children with disabilities in our State, as well as their families and the professionals includes:

### **Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Maryland**

PBIS is a research-based, school-wide systems approach to improve school climate and create safer and more effective schools. PBIS is a process, not a program or a curriculum. The process focuses on improving a school's ability to teach expectations and support positive behavior for all students. PBIS provides systems for schools to design, implement, and evaluate effective school-wide, classroom, non-classroom, and student-specific discipline plans. PBIS is a team-based process for data review, data-based problem solving and intervention, ongoing planning, and monitoring of interventions. PBIS implementation includes school-wide procedures and processes intended for: all students, all staff and in all settings. This includes individual classrooms, teachers and non-classroom settings and related staff.

- *PBIS Maryland* consists of three partners: MSDE, Sheppard Pratt Health System, and The Johns Hopkins University Center for the Prevention of Children Violence.
- 757 schools in 24 of Maryland's LSSs have been trained in school-wide PBIS since 1999; 668 of those schools are actively implementing universal strategies with fidelity to the model.
- Maryland uses a coaching model for PBIS and has trained a total of 283 coaches since 1999. Behavior Support Coaches are school psychologists, social workers, counselors, administrators, behavior specialists, resource teachers or other identified employees of local school systems who provide additional support to the PBIS Leadership Teams in the schools to which they are assigned. The Behavior Support Coaches are critical to the high quality implementation of PBIS and dissemination of evidence-based practices across trained schools.

In Maryland, the emphasis since 1999 has been on training schools in universal, school-wide PBIS. At that level, safer and more effective schools are achieved when a trained team implements the process for establishing systems that support students and staff in each school building, within its own context. Schools begin their school-wide implementation of PBIS by establishing a set of consistent expectations for classroom and non-classroom settings; defining them in the context of each setting; teaching the expectations to the students in each setting and acknowledging and reinforcing students' success when meeting those expectations. For students exhibiting challenging behavior, Targeted and Intensive PBIS interventions are utilized to maintain these students in their least restrictive environment.

### **The Steering Committee on Students with Emotional Disabilities**

MSDE's Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, in collaboration with MHA and the Maryland Coalition of Families for Children's Mental Health, and the University of Maryland Center for School Mental Health sponsored two Forums on Meeting the Needs of Students with Emotional Disabilities in the School Setting. Over 300 family members, advocates, mental health professionals, educators, and State personnel came together to review Maryland's data and outcomes for students with emotional disabilities (EDs), and discuss common issues, strengths, and gaps in the services being provided to students with EDs in school settings. Using the information and expertise gathered through the Forums, a Steering Committee was convened to study the identified issues and concerns. The Steering Committee identified five critical issues for children with EDs, including: Discipline and Behavior Management, the stigma of being labeled "Emotionally Disturbed;" Appropriate Identification of EDs, the Development and Implementation of IEPs, and Transition services and supports. The Steering Committee examined the root causes of these challenges, and identified key strategies for addressing these critical issues. In September 2010, the Steering Committee published and disseminated a report with recommendations and strategies to improve outcomes for this population of students.

## **The Kennedy Krieger Classroom Immersion and Technical Assistance Programs**

MSDE's Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services has awarded funding to the Kennedy Krieger Institute's Center for Autism and Related Disorders (CARD) to develop programs to help meet the increasing need for training and technical assistance in addressing the unique developmental and educational needs of children and children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Through this program, CARD staff assists in the provision of training and technical assistance to local Infants and Toddlers Programs, preschool special education programs, and LSSs in support of the delivery of early intervention and special education services to children identified with ASD, ages birth to 21, and their families.

The Professional Classroom Immersion Training Program is a comprehensive training program, which allows professionals who work with young children with ASD to be integrated within a preexisting infant and toddler or preschool classroom at Kennedy Krieger Institute and receive intensive training from the professionals who created and work within the context of the model.

The Technical Assistance Program is focused on affecting systems change at the local level and improving individual child and student outcomes through targeted training, observation, and consultation for personnel directly involved in teaching and supporting the developmental and educational needs of children with ASD in classroom settings.

These training opportunities are designed to prepare professionals to implement a variety of evidence-based strategies to address the specific social, communication, and behavioral challenges of children with ASD in their own therapeutic setting (home, community, or school-based) in an effort to support and maintain students with ASD in the least restrictive environment.

## **Medicaid Home and Community Based Services Waiver for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (Autism Waiver)**

The Maryland General Assembly, in 1998, adopted Senate Bill 99 requiring MSDE and DHMH to apply to the federal Medicaid agency, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), for a waiver to provide an alternative to institutional care for children with Autism, ages 1-21. Children enrolled in the Autism Waiver receive home and community based services funded through Medical Assistance in addition to services the child receives that are mandated by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These services are essential to maintaining children and children with ASD in their homes and communities. The Autism Waiver is currently approved to serve 900 children and there are currently over 3,200 children who are on a Registry waiting for an Autism Waiver vacancy. Children must meet three general criteria for eligibility: financial; medical; and technical. Children participating in the Autism Waiver receive a Medical Assistance card and are eligible to receive intensive individual support services (up to 25 hours per week), therapeutic integration (up to 20 hours per week), family

training (40 hours annually), residential, environmental accessibility adaptations, and respite care (336 hours annually).

### ***AutismConnect* website**

The *AutismConnect* website ([www.autismconnectmd.org](http://www.autismconnectmd.org)) is designed to assist stakeholders throughout the process of early intervention, identification, and developing and implementing an Individualized Education Program (IEP), Section 504 Plan, or home program in order to meet the unique needs of individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). The website focuses specifically on research, educational resources, and advocacy organizations available to support families in Maryland. The site is comprehensive in nature and features information regarding:

- The diagnostic process;
- Early identification and intervention;
- Treatment modalities;
- Effective practices;
- Instructional methods and strategies;
- Links to national, State, and local organizations;
- MSDE initiatives and research partnerships; and
- A portal to Pathfinders for Autism, a local non-profit agency that can provide stakeholders with further assistance in accessing resources

### **Maryland Mental Health Workforce Steering Committee**

The Maryland Mental Health Workforce Steering Committee supports MSDE and MHA in their commitment to provide qualified professionals and paraprofessionals to work with children with mental health needs and their families in their home and community setting. The Steering Committee strives to assist in the development of core competencies, strategies, and recommendations for improving and increasing the mental health workforce throughout the State. The Maryland Mental Health Workforce Steering Committee is dedicated to developing core competencies, strategies, and recommendations to ensure:

- The recruitment and retention of a sufficient number of qualified professionals and paraprofessionals to meet the needs of children with mental health needs and their families in Maryland;
- Quality training of Maryland's children's mental health workforce;
- An increased number of children's mental health development and training programs in the State;
- A uniformity of Maryland standards across equivalent training programs for mental health providers of services to children with mental health needs and their families; and
- Effective credentialing of children's mental health providers in the State.



The Maryland Mental Health Workforce Steering Committee has developed a White Paper and Workforce Core Competencies, which have informed the creation of online Workforce Development modules for professionals.

## ***Section VI: Hospitalizations***

### **Overview**

This section provides an analysis of the number of placements in hospitalizations. This includes a Statewide summary and analysis by each of the placing/funding Agencies represented in this category. Hospitalizations include the following placements: General Hospitalization and Psychiatric Hospitalization. Hospitalization Placements were reported by DHR and DJS only.

### **Definitions**

**General Hospitalization:** Hospitalization for a medical (non-psychiatric) illness or injury.

**Psychiatric Hospitalization:** Hospitalization for a mental health disorder/emergency.

### **Hospitalizations: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010**

Table 78 (page 111) provides an overview of the number of placements reported in the single-day count by jurisdiction and location of placement. The first column provides the number of out-of-home placements from the home jurisdiction on the single-day count. The second column provides the percentage that number represents with regard to the total number of Statewide placements on that date. The columns that follow provide the name of the jurisdiction where the placement occurred. The rows at the bottom of the table provide the percentage of placements from the jurisdiction that are also placed in that jurisdiction. The final row provides the percentage of placements in that jurisdiction, out of the total number of Statewide placements reported on that date.

## Hospitalizations: Number of Placements on January 31, 2010 by Home and Placement Jurisdiction

Hospitalizations, All Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	2	6.7%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	2	6.7%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	12	40.0%	0	0	2	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	2	6.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Frederick	1	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	1	3.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	1	3.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	3	10.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	1	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	1	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Washington	3	10.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Wicomico	1	3.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	30	100.0%	0	1	6	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	3
jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	3.3%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	3.3%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%	13.3%	10.0%

Table 78: Hospitalizations on January 31, 2010

## ***DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (DHR)***

### ***Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements***

Children and children in hospitalizations generally represent fewer than 1% of all children in DHR OOH placements (Table 9, page 28). Unlike family foster homes, community-based, and non-community-based placements, hospitalizations are typically short-term. Therefore it is more useful to analyze the number of placements (using entries and exits) than the number of children in these settings at the end of the year. The number of new hospitalization placements has decreased 13% between FY08 and FY10, and during the same time period the number of exits has also declined. Although this has resulted in a larger number of children in placement at the end of FY10 than in FY08, this should not be interpreted as a significant change due to the small numbers of children in such placements, and the shorter length of stays.

<b><i>Population Flow – Hospitalizations (count of placements, not children)</i></b>				
<b>State Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Placements at Start of FY</b>	<b>Starts in FY</b>	<b>Ends in FY</b>	<b>Placements at End of FY</b>
FY08	34	223	238	19
FY09	19	223	211	31
FY10	31	193	201	23
Change from FY08	-9%	-13%	-16%	21%
Average Yearly Change	-5%	-7%	-8%	10%
Recent Year Change	63%	-13%	-5%	-26%

**Table 79: Population Flow – Hospitalizations (count of placements, not children)**

### **In-State & Out-of-State (OOS)**

Due to the scale of numbers, data on children in OOS hospitalizations cannot be presented.

When aggregate data shows only a small number of children in any one category, confidentiality may be compromised, and so this data is suppressed.

## *Gender, Race and Age*

### Gender

Unlike all other categories previously discussed, there is no significant discrepancy in the gender distribution of children in DHR hospitalization placements. The three-year averages are each approximately 50% (49.8% for males, 50.2% for females). These proportions appear to be consistent during the three-year period. (Table 80)

<i>DHR Hospitalizations– Percent of Placements by Gender</i>		
State Fiscal Year	Male	Female
FY08	49.4%	50.6%
FY09	49.6%	50.4%
FY10	50.4%	49.6%

**Table 80: DHR Hospitalizations– Percent of Placements by Gender**

### Race

Again, the demographic breakdown of children/children in hospitalizations does not follow the pattern of the previous types of placement categories. Based on three-year averages, black/African-American children comprise approximately 48% of the population, with white children comprising approximately 40%, and other races comprise approximately 12% of the population. (Table 81)

<i>DHR Hospitalizations – Percent of Placements by Race</i>									
Fiscal Year	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	White	Bi-Racial/ Multiple Races Identified	Other	Data Unavailable	Total
FY08	0.0%	*	54.9%	0.0%	35.4%	4.7%	*	*	100.0%
FY09	0.0%	*	48.8%	0.0%	37.6%	7.0%	*	*	100.0%
FY10	*	*	40.6%	*	46.0%	6.7%	*	3.6%	100.0%

**Table 81: DHR Hospitalizations – Percent of Placements by Race**

*\*Due to the scale of numbers, data on children in these categories cannot be presented.<sup>23</sup>*

---

<sup>23</sup> When aggregate data show only a small number of children in any one category, confidentiality may be compromised, and so this data is suppressed.

## Age

On January 31, 2010, approximately 65% of children in hospitalization placements were ages 16 to 20. Due to the scale of numbers, data on children in other age groups cannot be presented.

When aggregate data show only a small number of children in any one category, confidentiality may be compromised, and so this data is suppressed.

<i>DHR Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Age</i>								
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>11-13</b>	<b>14-16</b>	<b>17-18</b>	<b>Over 18</b>	<b>Not Specify</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Median Age</b>	<b>Average Age</b>
<b>FY08</b>	12%	59%	29%	0%	0%	75	16.1	16.0
<b>FY09</b>	18%	56%	25%	1%	0%	72	16.3	16.0
<b>FY10</b>	7%	70%	23%	0%	0%	69	16.1	16.0

**Table 82: DHR Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Age**

## *Analysis for Cost*

According to available data, no costs were incurred by DHR in FY10 for hospitalization placements.

## Data Highlights

- Fewer than 1% of all DHR out-of-home placements are hospitalizations.
- Entries into hospitalization have decreased 13% over the past three fiscal years.
- There is an equal distribution of males and females in hospitalization placements.
- Over the past three fiscal years, approximately 48% of children hospitalized have been black/African-American, and 40% have been white.
- According to data available data, no costs were incurred by DHR in FY10 for hospitalization placements.

## ***DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE SERVICES (DJS)***

### ***Three-Year Trend Analysis for Number of Placements***

This category includes placements in psychiatric hospitals. Over the past three FYs about 3% of the total placements fell in this group. The total number of children at the start of FY08 was 12 and was reduced by 25% to 9 children at the start of FY10 (Table 83). Male placements increased by 5 percentage points from 76% in FY08 to 81% in FY10 thereby decreasing the female placements by 5 percentage points (Table 84). The black/African-American race group increased from 43% in FY08 to 54% in FY10 (Table 85, on page 116). The average age at the time of placement remained at 16.0 in all three FYs (Table 86, page 116).

<b><i>Population Flow – Hospitalization (count of placements or children)</i></b>				
<b>State Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Placements at Start of FY</b>	<b>Starts in FY</b>	<b>Ends in FY</b>	<b>Placements at End of FY</b>
FY08	12	63	63	12
FY09	12	60	63	9
FY10	9	60	58	11
Change from FY08	-25%	-5%	-8%	-8%
Average Yearly Change	-13%	-2%	-4%	-4%
Recent Year Change	-25%	0%	-8%	22%

**Table 83: DJS Population Flow – Hospitalization**

### ***Gender, Race and Age***

#### **Gender**

<b><i>DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Gender</i></b>		
<b>State Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
FY08	76%	24%
FY09	76%	24%
FY10	81%	19%

**Table 84: DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Gender**

## Race

FY08 - FY10

<i>DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Race</i>									
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>American Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Bi- Racial/ Multiple Races Identified</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Data Unavailable</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>FY08</b>	0.0%	0.0%	42.7%	0.0%	52.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%
<b>FY09</b>	1.4%	0.0%	47.2%	0.0%	48.6%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	100.0%
<b>FY10</b>	0.0%	0.0%	53.6%	0.0%	43.5%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%

**Table 85: DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Race**

## Age

<i>DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Age</i>								
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>11-13</b>	<b>14-16</b>	<b>17-18</b>	<b>Over 18</b>	<b>Not Specify</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Median Age</b>	<b>Average Age</b>
<b>FY08</b>	12%	59%	29%	0%	0%	75	16.1	16.0
<b>FY09</b>	18%	56%	25%	1%	0%	72	16.3	16.0
<b>FY10</b>	7%	70%	23%	0%	0%	69	16.1	16.0

**Table 86: DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Placements by Age**

Table 87, page 117, shows the percentage of children placed by their County of residence (COR) as of January 31, 2010 in Hospitalizations out of the total population of OOH placements. For example, on January 31, 2010 3.2% of the children in OOH Placements from Wicomico County were placed by the DJS in Hospitalizations.



<b><i>DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Children Placed by COR</i></b>	
<b>COR</b>	<b>1/31/2010</b>
Allegany	0.0%
Anne Arundel	1.3%
Baltimore City	1.2%
Baltimore County	1.4%
Calvert	0.0%
Caroline	0.0%
Carroll	0.0%
Cecil	0.0%
Charles	0.0%
Dorchester	0.0%
Frederick	0.0%
Garrett	0.0%
Harford	0.0%
Howard	0.0%
Kent	0.0%
Montgomery	0.0%
Prince George's	0.0%
Queen Anne's	0.0%
St. Mary's	0.0%
Somerset	0.0%
Talbot	0.0%
Washington	2.6%
Wicomico	3.2%
Worcester	0.0%
Out-of-State	0.0%
<b>Maryland</b>	<b>0.8%</b>

**Table 87: DJS Hospitalization – Percent of Children Placed by COR**

### **Highlights:**

- Over the past three years approximately 3% of DJS total placements fell in this category.
- The total number of children at the start of FY08 was 12 and was reduced by 25% to 9 children at the start of FY10.
- Male placements increased by 5 percentage points from 76% in FY08 to 81% in FY10.
- The African-American race group increased from 43% in FY08 to 54% in FY10.
- The average age at the time of placement remained at 16.0 in all three FYs.

## ***Section VII: Family Preservation Services***

LDSSs have a long tradition of providing family preservation services, where appropriate, to families presenting with moderate to serious risks of child maltreatment. Rooted in the 1980 federal child welfare law to make “reasonable efforts to prevent out-of-home placement,” Maryland has provided in-home interventions for nearly three decades, since the early 1980s. From 1990 to the present, Interagency Family Preservation Services (IFPS) have been offered to Maryland families with children at imminent risk of placement from all child-serving agencies.

Through FY07, IFPS was administered by the Governor’s Office for Children. After that time, IFPS was integrated into DHR’s In-Home/Family Preservation services. During the last few years, DHR implemented its new child welfare information system - the Maryland Children’s Electronic Social Services Information Exchange (MD CHESSIE). During FY08, IFPS cases were served by the LDSSs although there were no service codes in MD CHESSIE available to identify these cases. Beginning with FY09, improvements in MD CHESSIE were implemented to identify IFPS cases. This year’s report, therefore, will focus on DHR In-Home/Family Preservation provided services, including IFPS. Breakouts for IFPS cases for FY09 and FY10, during which time updates became available in MD CHESSIE to identify these cases, will also be presented.

Along with the transfer of IFPS to DHR, as discussed in last year’s report, DHR is shifting from the use of the North Carolina Family Assessment Scale (NCFAS) to the use of the Maryland Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths assessment (MD CANS). The MD CANS is being readied for implementation effective July 1, 2011, and data from that assessment will not be available until the FY12 report in December 2012. Accordingly, the results of an interim assessment used to gauge the risk of maltreatment, the Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA), therefore, is included in this year’s report on family preservation.

Finally, DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services is undergoing a consolidation based on a review and decisions made to streamline the in-home service system and make better use of assessment data to gauge the intensity of in-home services that a family needs. This multi-year effort involves a review and changes to DHR’s Safety assessment (SAFE-C), the Risk Assessment (MFRA), and inclusion of the MD CANS to provide, once fully implemented, a well-rounded picture of a family’s safety, risk, and functioning that will drive service planning as well as the intensity of in-home service that a family and its children receive. This approach will replace the multi-tiered In-Home/Family Preservation categorization schemes utilized in the past (e.g., Families Now Levels 1 through 4), and will simplify both the counts associated with these families, as well as provide a more concise picture over time of the levels of safety, risk, needs, and strengths of families and their children over time. Implementation has been slowed due to budget constraints impacting improvements required in MD CHESSIE in order to complement the changes in policy and practice changes.

In summary, DHR is transforming its In-Home/Family Preservation services policies, practices, and information system, and that transformation is ongoing. This report contains the best available data during this time of transition.

### **Service Counts for DHR In-Home Services**

In-home/Family Preservation Services currently include a number of services that have been developed over the last few decades, and include a long list of services that will be consolidated:

- Services to Families with Children – Intake;
- Services to Families with Children – Continuing;
- Continuing Protective Services;
- Family Preservation Services;
- Consolidated Services;
- Intensive Family Services;
- Families Now;
- Families Now - Level I;
- Families Now - Level II;
- Families Now - Level III; and
- Interagency Family Preservation Services
- Current consolidation plans include transforming these categories into three needed for future reporting:
  - Services to Families with Children – Intake (a short short-term service featuring an assessment of family needs, making it a different service than the traditional In-Home/Family Preservation service);
  - Interagency Family Preservation Services (needed to keep track of the interagency services provided to children and families); and
  - In-Home/Family Preservation Services (collapsing the rest into one category for the In-Home/Family Preservation services traditionally provided by DHR).
- For this report, the data are organized as
  - All In-Home, comprised of:
    - DHR Family Preservation – all the categories currently in use; and
    - IFPS – only the one category, Interagency Family Preservation Services

A review of the last three years' information on overall numbers served and newly served families indicates that there has been a downward trend in the overall number of families and children served in In-Home/Family Preservation programs. Table 88, page 121, contains data for all In-Home services, DHR Family Preservation services, and IFPS. It should be noted that the breakdowns are unavailable for FY08, only partially available for FY09, and fully available for FY10, based on MD CHESSIE data entry for these In-Home/Family Preservation cases.

In all, DHR In-Home served and newly served families have decreased by 20% from FY08 to FY10. This may be an artifact of the early implementation of MD CHESSIE and there is the possibility of some over over-counting of cases in FY08 during the early implementation of MD CHESSIE. Internally-collected raw data from LDSS offices on the number of in-home cases at the end of each month supports this downward trend.

Concerns have been raised about the downward trend in In-Home/Family Preservation during the same time period in which DHR out-of-home OOH foster care placements have dropped significantly. The reasoning is that if foster care placements are decreasing, then In-Home/Family Preservation services should be increasing. This sounds like a reasonable relationship about the service trends between in-home and out-of-home programs, however, it ignores the increasing impact of a third factor: DHR's roll-out of a new family-centered practice model as part of its Place Matters Initiative, featuring the use of family involvement meetings. During these meetings it is often the case that solutions excluding LDSS in-home or OOH involvement are found, making it possible for children to remain safely at home and for relatives, friends, or other resources to support the family on an ongoing basis.

It should also be noted that DHR In-Home/Family Preservation Services touches the lives of over 17,000 children per fiscal year. In FY10, this is 42% more children than were served through foster care (just over 12,000 children served in foster care).

Families and Children Served and Newly Served						
In-Home: DHR Family Preservation Services and Interagency Family Preservation Services						
In-Home Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY08	9,868	20,811	2.1	6,819	14,474	2.1
FY09	9,142	19,769	2.2	6,323	13,659	2.2
FY10	7,882	17,210	2.2	5,438	11,726	2.2
DHR Family Preservation Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY08 *	----- Breakdown not available -----					
FY09 *	8,573	18,542	2.2	5,763	12,453	2.2
FY10	6,851	14,798	2.2	4,606	9,777	2.1
Interagency Family Preservation Services						
	All Cases Served during FY			New Cases during FY		
	Cases	Children	Child/Case	Cases	Children	Child/Case
FY08 *	----- Breakdown not available -----					
FY09 *	569	1,227	2.2	560	1,206	2.2
FY10	1,031	2,412	2.3	832	1,949	2.3
* IFPS cases were not coded in MD CHESSIE for FY08 and partially coded in FY09.						
The previously reported figures for FY08 and FY09, based on LDSS raw data, are:						
FY08: Newly Served IFPS-866; Newly Served At Risk Children-1,565						
FY09: Newly Served IFPS-971; Newly Served At Risk Children-1,697						
FY10: MD CHESSIE coding for IFPS cases was complete during this fiscal year						

**Table 88**

## Analysis of Maryland Family Risk Assessment for In-Home Services

DHR In-Home/Family Preservation workers are required to complete a Maryland Family Risk Assessment (MFRA) while the family is receiving services. An intake and closing risk assessment is required, as well as additional ratings every six months or when the family situation changes. The assessment is six pages and includes a central section wherein workers score family observations in five risk categories: (a) History of Child Maltreatment, (b) Type and Extent of Current Child Maltreatment Investigation, (c) Child Characteristics, (d) Caregiver Characteristics, and (e) Familial, Social and Economic Characteristics. A four-level risk rating of no risk, low risk, moderate risk, or high risk is assigned by applying relatively long narrative definitions of past incidents or the current incident leading to In-Home/Family Preservation services. The final section of the MFRA is the Overall Rating of Risk. Workers enter their summary risk ratings for the five preceding risk categories before assigning an overall rating of risk for the family. Workers use the overall family risk rating to inform their case management decisions including case opening.

Workers are trained on the MFRA during pre-service orientation and through ongoing supervision. Currently certification is not required in order to begin using of the MFRA, which raises some concern about the validity and reliability of this assessment. DHR is reviewing its use of the MFRA in assisting workers with the task of predicting risk of maltreatment to the children it serves. While there are no immediate plans, it is likely that DHR will be making plans to shift away from the MFRA pending further review of the instrument.

Analysis of MFRA data for In-Home/Family Preservation services is therefore descriptive, and breakdowns between DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services and IFPS are available only for FY10.

### *MFRA Intake Ratings*

Around the start of an In-Home/Family Preservation service case, workers are required to complete a MFRA rating for the family. Based on data available in MD CHESSIE, this requirement is not fulfilled for one-third (33% in FY08) to approximately one-fifth (21% in FY10) of the cases. This shortcoming mostly reflects a failure to document the results of the MFRA rating in MD CHESSIE, rather than the failure to make a MFRA rating. Efforts begun in FY10 to scrutinize the quality of case record documentation, as part of DHR's new quality assurance program, should effect a higher rate of MFRA completion in MD CHESSIE when FY11 data are examined next year. Table 89, page 123, contains the initial MFRA ratings for all cases, DHR family preservation cases, starting with FY08, as well as IFPS.

Examining FY10, the most accurate year so far for collecting MFRA data in MD CHESSIE, a general pattern emerges for all cases: families rated at moderate risk are the most common group receiving services (representing 36% for all families receiving services), followed closely by families with no/low risk (34%), and lastly by families with high risk (9%). These patterns are similar among FY10 families receiving either DHR family preservation services (no/low risk - 35%, moderate - 35%, high - 8%). However, there is a noticeable upward shift in risk among families in FY10 receiving IFPS (no/low risk - 23%, moderate - 41%, high - 12%). It appears that the IFPS program serves a substantially higher proportion of families at moderate and high risk of child maltreatment than the DHR family preservation services.

Although not as pronounced, this difference is noticeable among the DHR Family Preservation services families versus the IFPS families served during FY09. While during this year it is estimated that MD CHESSIE was not fully populated with IFPS data, it appears that greater proportions of families served in IFPS had higher risk ratings than DHR family preservation families during FY09.

<b>Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings</b>						
<b>In-Home: DHR Family Preservation Services and Interagency Family Preservation Services</b>						
<b>DHR In-Home Services -- All Cases</b>						
		<b>Percent</b>				
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Missing</b>
<b>FY08</b>	9,868	11%	24%	26%	6%	33%
<b>FY09</b>	9,142	12%	27%	31%	7%	23%
<b>FY10</b>	7,882	7%	27%	36%	9%	21%
<b>DHR Family Preservation Cases</b>						
		<b>Percent</b>				
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Missing</b>
<b>FY08 *</b>	----- Breakdown not available -----					
<b>FY09 *</b>	8,572	12%	28%	30%	8%	22%
<b>FY10</b>	6,851	7%	28%	35%	8%	21%
<b>Interagency Family Preservation Services</b>						
		<b>Percent</b>				
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Missing</b>
<b>FY08 *</b>	----- Breakdown not available -----					
<b>FY09 *</b>	570	5%	22%	41%	7%	26%
<b>FY10</b>	1,031	3%	20%	41%	12%	24%
<b>* IFPS cases were not coded in MD CHESSIE for FY08 and partially coded in FY09.</b>						
<b>The previously reported figures for FY08 and FY09, based on LDSS raw data, are:</b>						
<b>FY08: Newly Served IFPS-866; Newly Served At Risk Children-1,565</b>						
<b>FY09: Newly Served IFPS-971; Newly Served At Risk Children-1,697</b>						
<b>FY10: MD CHESSIE coding for IFPS cases was complete during this fiscal year</b>						

**Table 89**

This preliminary analysis suggests that, at the start of services, the families receiving IFPS have a higher level of risk for child maltreatment than the DHR family preservation programs. Further data available for next year's report will serve to validate this basic pattern of initial MFRA risk among families receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services.

Another observation that can be gleaned from Table 89, is the high proportion of In-Home/Family Preservation cases that appear to start out at no or low risk, as follows, using FY10 data. Table 90, page 124, isolates these percentages. Overall, one-third of the families starting out with In-Home/Family Preservation Services are at no/low risk, comprised of 7% at no risk, and 27% of low risk (for comparison, IFPS has 3% at no risk and 20% low risk at the start of those services). There are several factors that lead a family to In-Home Services, including immediate safety

issues that are being addressed and resolved (meaning that risk of maltreatment is low and some level of monitoring is appropriate), the return home of a child in Out-of-Home Services and In-Home services are rendered to assure a smooth reunification process, and often there are concrete purchases (including rent, electricity, clothing, automobile repairs) accompanying the start of an In-Home case that helps to assure that the risk of maltreatment (particularly neglect) is avoided.

While the number of families and children receiving DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services has been decreasing the last few years, the question of appropriate intake for these services remains a reasonable concern. During difficult budget times, it is critical to ensure that these services are provided to help families at any risk level of maltreatment. A closer inspection of intake eligibility criteria will help DHR in its mission to serve the most vulnerable children and families.

Initial Risk based on MFRA Ratings						
In-Home: DHR Family Preservation Services and Interagency Family Preservation Services						
FY10 Proportion of Families Served starting out with No/Low Risk Ratings						
	No	Low	No/Low			
In-Home	7%	27%	34%			
DHR FP	7%	28%	35%			
IFPS	3%	20%	23%			

**Table 90**

#### *MFRA Ratings: Comparison of Initial and Final Risk Ratings*

As the data are available for examining MFRA initial and final risk ratings among families receiving services, a general question that can be answered is, are families better off as a result of receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services? The following tables help to examine the progress experienced by families receiving services.

One method for studying the progress made is to obtain the risk rating for a family at the start of services and compare it to the risk rating at the end of services, to observe any changes in risk during the course of services. One of the goals is to reduce the level of risk for families who receive In-Home/Family Preservation services. Table 91, page 125, presents this data for families whose services ended and MD CHESSIE contains both an initial and final MFRA rating for the family.

Due to the high rates of incomplete MFRA risk ratings for this analysis, only the following tentative impressions can be offered at this time:

- High-Risk Families: Initially rated at overall high risks, 25% to 34% of families remain at a high risk; and 66% to 75% of families improve (e.g., decrease) their risk.
- Moderate-Risk Families: Initially rated at overall moderate risk, fewer than 5% of families worsen in their level of risk; 39% of families remain at a moderate risk; and 58% improve their risk; and



- Low-Risk Families: Initially rated at overall low risk, 7% of families worsen in their level of risk; 82% remain at a low risk; and approximately 10% improve their risk.

While tentative, this descriptive analysis suggests that a far greater proportion of families experience decreased risk of child maltreatment while receiving In-Home/Family Preservation Services rather than the reverse.

Comparison of Initial and Final MFRA Ratings for Closed Cases								
Percent of Families Experiencing Worse, Same, or Improved Risk Rating at Case Closing								
In-Home Services – All Cases								
							Cases with	
			Based on Final Rating, Risk Level				Incomplete	Percent
	Initial Risk	n	Worse	Same	Improved		MFRA Data	Incomplete
<b>FY08</b>	<b>High</b>	555	0%	34%	66%	<b>FY08</b>	3,635	37%
	<b>Moderate</b>	2,420	4%	41%	56%			
	<b>Low</b>	2,294	8%	83%	9%			
	<b>None</b>	964	0%	100%	0%			
<b>FY09</b>	<b>High</b>	621	0%	28%	72%	<b>FY09</b>	2,649	29%
	<b>Moderate</b>	2,585	3%	39%	58%			
	<b>Low</b>	2,380	8%	82%	10%			
	<b>None</b>	907	0%	100%	0%			
<b>FY10</b>	<b>High</b>	516	0%	25%	75%	<b>FY10</b>	3,139	40%
	<b>Moderate</b>	2,077	2%	37%	61%			
	<b>Low</b>	1,775	6%	83%	11%			
	<b>None</b>	375	0%	100%	0%			

**Table 91**

Another way to view the improvements in level of risk experienced by families while receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services is to consider a change matrix. Table 92, page 126 presents, along the left side, the breakdown of families based on initial risk ratings, and then graphically illustrates the percentages of families by risk rating at case close. Although this presentation suffers as well due to the high proportion of incomplete cases, it does provide some insight into the changes occurring among families receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services.

In-Home: All Cases -- FY08 through FY09						
Matrix indicating Percent of Families at Final Risk Level, Based on Initial Risk Level						
FY08	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	6,373	Total	1,402	3,369	1,316	319
	1,076	None	90%	7%	2%	1%
	2,305	Low	9%	83%	7%	1%
	2,435	Moderate	8%	48%	40%	4%
	557	High	7%	35%	25%	34%
	3,495	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY09	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	6,641	Total	1,432	3,577	1,350	286
	1,029	None	88%	8%	3%	0%
	2,389	Low	10%	81%	7%	1%
	2,599	Moderate	9%	49%	38%	3%
	624	High	7%	42%	24%	27%
	2,501	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
FY10	Count	Initial Risk	None	Low	Moderate	High
	4,830	Total	790	2,846	994	201
	443	None	85%	12%	2%	1%
	1,782	Low	11%	83%	5%	1%
	2,087	Moderate	8%	52%	37%	2%
	518	High	8%	43%	24%	25%
	3,052	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

**Table 92**

The percentages contained in Table 92 correspond to the count of families in each of the initial risk categories. For example, during FY08, 557 families (for whom both an initial and final MFRA rating was recorded in MD CHESSIE) entered In-Home/Family Preservation services with a high level of maltreatment risk. By the time of closing the case, 7% of those families had no risk, 35% had low risk, 25% had moderate risk, and 34% (or one-third) still had a high level of maltreatment risk. This means that two-thirds of the high-risk families, for whom both MFRA intake/final risk ratings were recorded, were able to decrease their level of risk during services.

The gray-shaded cells in these matrices represent no change in risk rating from intake to final rating, yellow-shaded cells indicate a worsening in maltreatment risk, and the green-shaded cells represent improvement (e.g., a decrease) in risk. Complete data are needed to make final conclusions, but tentative conclusions are that most families experience no change or a decrease in risk during the course of In-Home/Family Preservation services, and that this pattern is persistent from FY08 through FY10.

Additional change matrices are presented as well for FY10, for the DHR Family Preservation served families, and the IFPS served families (Table 93, page 127). Because the bulk of families are served in DHR Family Preservation, the first part of Table 93, page 127 resembles the Statewide presentation of all In-Home/Family Preservation services shown in Table 92.

As earlier noted, IFPS families tend to start services with higher levels of risk. Among the IFPS families that started out at high risk, it appears that a larger proportion of them (82%) experience decreased risk over time compared to the DHR Family Preservation population (73%).

<b>DHR Family Preservation and IFPS -- FY10Only</b>						
<b>Matrix indicating Percent of Families at Final Risk Level, Based on Initial Risk Level</b>						
<b>DHR Family Preservation</b>						
<b>FY10</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Initial Risk</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>
	4,149	Total	720	2,467	794	165
	418	None	85%	12%	2%	1%
	1,604	Low	11%	83%	5%	1%
	1,725	Moderate	9%	53%	36%	2%
	402	High	9%	42%	22%	27%
	2,702	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				
<b>Interagency Family Preservation Services</b>						
<b>FY10</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Initial Risk</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>
	681	Total	70	379	200	36
	25	None	80%	12%	8%	0%
	178	Low	12%	78%	7%	3%
	362	Moderate	7%	49%	41%	3%
	116	High	3%	48%	31%	18%
	350	Missing initial, final, or both ratings				

**Table 93**

Prior to transferring to DHR, IFPS had more stringent eligibility requirements that focused on families with children at imminent risk of out-of-home placement, and its service model featured lower caseloads and higher requirements for contact (face-to-face time) with family members. As part of the shift to DHR, eligibility criteria were subject to local preferences, along with service model design changes that LDSS offices felt would make the interagency program work best in the local agency. These kinds of changes usually lead to a loosening of eligibility criteria as well as variations in service delivery. Even so, based on the initial risk data indicating that a higher proportion of high risk families enter the IFPS program, and based on the positive shifts occurring among IFPS cases based on the shifts in maltreatment risk obtained from Table 93 for IFPS families, it is possible that some remnant of the historically intensive focus of IFPS may have persisted after its absorption into the LDSS in-home service array.

Another more pressing matter that this section on MFRA risk ratings reveals, however, is whether the children served throughout DHR's In-Home/Family Preservation program are any better off as the result of these services. Among the children who received some type of In-Home/Family Preservation service during FY08 (20,811), FY09 (19,769), and FY10 (17,210), it is estimated, based on the proportion of families receiving final risk ratings in Table 93, that over 1,000 children served in FY08 were at high risk of maltreatment, nearly 850 children in FY09, and over 700 children served in FY10. Collectively, we should be concerned about the 2,500 children who, based on an extrapolation of MFRA ratings discussed in this section, ended services with their families at high risk of maltreatment.

Indeed, it is quite possible that many of these children were removed from their homes if the risk of maltreatment was too high to let them remain safely at home. Frontline Child Protective Services (CPS) workers and In-Home/Family Preservation workers make that kind of decision every day throughout Maryland, both during the time that a child is involved with an In-Home/Family Preservation service, and after the in-home service case has closed. There is also the possibility that a CPS investigation may have been initiated and conducted either during an In-Home/Family Preservation service, or after in-home services have closed. Sometimes CPS investigations lead to removal of children into foster care, and sometimes it is possible for the safety and risk factors to be removed from the child's midst, obviating the need for removal and foster care placement.

The next section addresses these issues, and answers the question as to whether children, during In-Home/Family Preservation services, or within one year of closing in-home services, experience either an indicated CPS investigation, or a foster care placement.

### **Analysis of Indicated Findings of Child Maltreatment and Non-Placement Rates**

This analysis focuses mainly on the question "Are the children better off?" by asking about bad outcomes, such as the occurrence of "indicated" CPS findings, and whether children are placed in foster care. Some may argue that having a CPS investigation and being placed in foster care is a good outcome for a child whose safety is threatened, and for whom the risk of maltreatment is so great that it is necessary to remove the child until a safe, permanent home can be found. As estimated in the previous section, for example, there are 2,500 children ending their In-Home/Family Preservation services at a high risk of maltreatment. In the course of providing In-Home/Family Preservation services, it is often during services that a CPS investigation needs to be initiated to address safety and risk issues, and/or the need for foster care placement becomes sharply defined and implemented.

The goal of In-Home/Family Preservation is to remove the risk of maltreatment, not the children from their homes. Families generally want to stay together even when challenges and serious deficiencies exist, and the LDSS In-Home staff members strive to assist with reaching that goal. Parents ultimately are responsible for making this work, and when it does not work for a family, CPS investigations need to be initiated and sometimes children need to be removed from their homes.

An "indicated" CPS finding refers to a decision made by a CPS investigator, upon completion of a child maltreatment investigation, that there is sufficient evidence, which has not been refuted, of child maltreatment. There are two other CPS findings, not reported here, including an "unsubstantiated" finding, meaning that there is not sufficient evidence to support the contention that maltreatment took place, or a "ruled out" finding, meaning that a CPS investigator determined that maltreatment did not take place.

Foster care placement begins with a removal from the home of a child for whom there is a serious safety or maltreatment risk, and the date of removal marks the beginning of the foster care

episode. In this analysis, only foster care placement is discussed - other Maryland Agencies place or fund the placement of children, however, this year's report concerns only foster care placement among the children who have participated in DHR's In-Home/Family Preservation services.

Three years' data has been compiled from MD CHESSIE to answer the following questions: (1) during the provision of In-Home/Family Preservation services, did a CPS investigation resulting in an indicated finding take place, and (2) during the year following family preservation case closure, did a CPS investigation resulting in an indicated finding take place. These measures have been constructed as follows:

- During Services – For each fiscal year listed, the children newly served in In-Home cases during that fiscal year are considered, and the observation time period each child is considered is 12 months following the start date of In-Home services (or the In-Home service close date, whichever comes first).
- Within 1 Year of Case Close – For each fiscal year listed, the children considered are those who were newly served during the fiscal year and whose In-Home cases closed within 12 months of the start date of In-Home Services. In other words, these are the same children as the “During Services” children whose cases closed during the 12 month observation period.

Table 94, below, displays the counts of families and children newly served each fiscal year. It should be noted that the CPS Indicated Investigations and foster care placement statistics require one year after the reported fiscal year for the “During Services” observation period to end, and require two years after the reported fiscal year for the “Within 1 Year of Case Closure” observation period to end. This means that, for this year's report, complete statistics are available for FY07 and FY08, and only “During Service” statistics are available for FY09.

Breakdowns for DHR Family Preservation Services and IFPS are not available for these years in MD CHESSIE, and will be available for FY10.

<b>In-Home Cases (All)</b>					
	<b>In-Home Newly Served Case Statistics</b>			<b>In-Home Child Statistics</b>	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Newly Served Cases</b>	<b>Newly Served &amp; Closed Cases Within 1 Year</b>	<b>% Closed within 1 Year</b>	<b>Newly Served Children</b>	<b>Newly Served &amp; Closed Within 1 Year</b>
<b>FY07 *</b>	5,590	4,295	76.8%	11,552	8,741
<b>FY08</b>	6,819	6,019	88.3%	14,474	12,641
<b>FY09</b>	6,323	5,544	87.7%	13,659	11,796

**Table 94 (\* FY07 included conversion to MD CHESSIE; hence data is incomplete for that year.)**

Using this construct, Table 95, page 130, contains the answers to both questions concerning CPS Indicated Investigations and foster care placement during In-Home services and within one year of case closing. It should be noted that the data accuracy of MD CHESSIE improved considerably during this time, starting with FY08, and that further scrutiny in next year's report will serve to provide further validation of the statistics presented here.

Indicated CPS Findings and Foster Care Placement Rates								
In-Home: DHR Family Preservation Services and Interagency Family Preservation Services								
	Indicated CPS Investigation				Out-of-Home Placement			
Fiscal Year	During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close		During Services		Within 1 Year of Case Close	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
FY07	2.0%	228	3.4%	299	4.6%	536	2.0%	179
FY08	2.1%	301	2.8%	353	3.1%	445	1.6%	206
FY09	2.5%	339	NA until FY12		3.5%	482	NA until FY12	

**Table 95**

### *“Indicated” CPS Investigations*

During service, the three-year success rates for this indicator are encouraging; - 2.5% or fewer of the children receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services are involved in an investigation that ends with an “indicated” finding. This does translate, however, into nearly 870 children for whom an “indicated” CPS finding was made. There is an increase of one half of a percentage point (0.5%) for Indicated CPS Investigations from FY07 to FY08, although it is premature to assume, given the data accuracy issues associated with MD CHESSIE’s early implementation, that this is the beginning of a trend.

Within one year of case closure, 3.4% of children (299) whose In-Home/Family Preservation services ended in FY07 experienced an “indicated” CPS investigation. For FY08, a lower percent of children whose In-Home services ended experienced an “indicated” CPS investigation (2.8%), although this represents a higher number of children (353) than FY07, due mainly to incomplete data for FY07.

### *Absence of Foster Care Placement*

During service, the three-year foster placement rate for this indicator was 4.6% or less for FY07 through FY09. There is a one percentage point drop from FY07 to FY09, although it is too early to determine whether this represents the beginning of a trend. Even so, this means that 1,463 children were removed from their homes during In-Home/Family Preservation services during these three fiscal years. As discussed earlier, the LDSS In-Home staff attempt to preserve families, but the successful result of that effort hinges on the parents. Therefore it is not necessarily a bad outcome for children who truly need to be removed and placed in foster care. At this point, when foster care placement is necessary, the LDSS staff has a much better experience with the child who needs to be placed, and the opportunity of having provided In-Home/Family Preservation services enables the LDSS to make an appropriate foster care placement.

Within one year of case closure, 2% of children (179) whose In-Home/Family Preservation services ended in FY07 experienced a foster care placement. For FY08, a slightly lower percentage of children whose In-Home services ended experienced a foster care placement (1.6%), although this represents a higher number of children (206) than FY07, due mainly to incomplete data for FY07.

Based on the MFRA ratings, it was estimated that 2,500 children receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services over the FY08 to FY10 period were rated at a high risk of child maltreatment by the end of services. Based on the foregoing analysis on “indicated” CPS investigations and foster care placement among families receiving In-Home/Family Preservation services during FY07 to FY09, it is not yet possible to obtain a complete count of children who experienced either an “indicated” CPS investigation or a foster care placement during and after services, but it is anticipated that further analysis of the high high-risk population identified at the end of In-Home/Family Preservation services will indicate that their additional needs or challenges that are presented during In-Home services will be met, even if that results in a foster care placement.

## **Summary**

DHR In-Home/Family Preservation services are a critical component of meeting the needs of vulnerable children and their families. In FY10, more than 17,000 children received In-Home/Family Preservation services while just over 12,000 children received foster care services. DHR’s Place Matters Initiative has had considerable success in its emphasis on family-centered practice and the use of family involvement meetings to find alternatives for children to entering the child welfare system.

Among those served in In-Home/Family Preservation services, based on FY08 (the most recent year for which there is complete data), most children served:

- Do not experience an “indicated” CPS investigation (97.9%) during services, and
- Do not experience a foster care placement (96.9%) during services.
  
- In addition, among those children whose In-Home/Family Preservation services ended, based on FY08, most children:
- Do not experience an “indicated” CPS investigation (97.2%) within 1 year of case close, and
- Do not experience a foster care placement (98.4%) within 1 year of case close.

Through improved practice changes initiated through the Place Matters Family Centered Practice, including family involvement meetings at critical trigger points during child welfare service delivery, DHR has experienced success in reducing its foster care population, shifting its placement population away from group care and toward family-based care, and reducing overall costs of foster care placements. Data quality in MD CHESSIE has improved substantially, and DHR's child welfare quality assurance program that has been rebuilt over the last year examines both the quality of care as well as the quality of data entry. The focus of the frontline remains to assure that the goals of safety, permanence, and well-being are met for our most vulnerable children, trying first to preserve and support families, and turning to foster care placement only when necessary.



## ***Section VIII: Children’s Cabinet Resource Development Initiatives & Conclusion***

### **Resource Development Initiatives**

The Children’s Cabinet and the Governor’s Office for Children are committed to improving outcomes for children and their families in Maryland. In addition to fulfilling Agency-specific mandates, Maryland’s child-serving Agencies also work collaboratively through the Children’s Cabinet to coordinate policies, evaluate Statewide needs, track progress on outcomes, and oversee funding to local jurisdictions to provide services which directly impact children’s well-being. The Governor’s Office for Children supports this work by:

- Convening the State Agencies, local partners, and community stakeholders to develop policies and initiatives which reflect the priorities of the Children’s Cabinet and the Governor;
- Managing the Children’s Cabinet Interagency Fund, which provided approximately \$25.5 million in FY10 to Local Management Boards through Community Partnership Agreements to provide needed services to children and families;
- Partnering with the LMBs in each Maryland jurisdiction to plan, coordinate, and develop comprehensive systems of care and fund and monitor the delivery of integrated services to children and families; and
- Informing the collective and specific work of the Children’s Cabinet by developing and supporting an interagency data management system, collecting and analyzing data, and reporting to the Governor, the Children’s Cabinet, the General Assembly, and other stakeholders on the progress of Maryland’s children.

Until last year, specific strategies of the Children’s Cabinet and the Governor’s Office for Children were articulated in two guiding documents: *Maryland’s Three-Year Children’s Plan* (and update) and *Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan*.

Since 2009, the work of the *Maryland Three Year Children’s Plan* has been subsumed in the *Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategy Plan*.

### ***The Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan***

In partnership with communities, families, children, and providers, as well as State and local Agencies, the Children’s Cabinet developed an Interagency Strategic Plan focused on improving the Statewide service delivery system for children and families. Although this plan works towards the improvement of services for children at all levels of need, special consideration is given to at-risk children.

The plan includes recommendations and strategies organized around eight themes:

- Family and Children Partnership
- Interagency Structures
- Workforce Development and Training
- Information Sharing
- Improving Access to Opportunities and Care
- Continuum of Opportunities, Supports, and Care
- Financing
- Education

## ***I. Care Management Entity (CME)***

In the past, the Children’s Cabinet has funded CMEs using intensive care coordination with a high-fidelity Wraparound practice model through LMBs in Baltimore City, Montgomery County, St. Mary’s County, and Wicomico County. CMEs manage care for high utilizing populations of children and children who typically are involved with multiple systems and are in or at high risk for OOH placements. On April 7, 2009, GOC, on behalf of the Children’s Cabinet, issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to create a CME in each of three regions to serve as an entry point for children, and families with intensive needs so that they can achieve the goals of safety, permanency, and well-being through intensive care coordination using a Wraparound service delivery model and the development of home- and community-based services.

In keeping with the recommendations and strategies that were set forth in the Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan (2008) (available at <http://www.goc.maryland.gov>), this RFP was the next step in the Children’s Cabinet’s efforts to provide family- and child-driven care that is individualized, effective, responsive, culturally competent, and community-based across all of the child and family-serving systems. Children with complex needs and their families typically are involved with multiple providers and systems, or are at very high risk for such involvement. No one provider or system can respond comprehensively to the constellation of needs of these children and families. As a consequence, children and families end up with multiple plans of care and multiple care coordinators, a situation that is confusing and inefficient for all concerned.

The CME provides a single “locus of accountability” for these children and families and supports the organization, management, delivery and financing of services and resources across multiple providers and systems. High fidelity Wraparound is the service delivery model used within the CME.

With this RFP, the Children’s Cabinet expanded intensive care management and high fidelity Wraparound from four jurisdictions to Statewide implementation using existing funds. On November 4, 2009, the Board of Public Works approved two contracts to cover the three regions as follows:

- **Baltimore City Region** (Baltimore City);
- **North Western Maryland Region** (Allegany County, Baltimore County, Carroll County, Frederick County, Garrett County, Harford County, Howard County, Montgomery County, Washington County); and
- **South Eastern Maryland Region** (Anne Arundel County, Calvert County, Caroline County, Cecil County, Charles County, Dorchester County, Kent County, Prince George's County, Queen Anne's County, St. Mary's County, Somerset County, Talbot County, Wicomico County, Worcester County).

The CMEs serve various populations of children with intensive needs. By definition, these children have involvement with multiple systems and have complex needs. Therefore, it is understood that there may be some overlap between populations for a particular child or family. However, the populations outlined below are described discretely due to the funding source limitations.

1. **RTC Waiver:** As previously discussed, Maryland is participating in a federal Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) 1915(c) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility (PRTF)<sup>24</sup> Demonstration Waiver (RTC Waiver) project whose purpose is to provide home- and community-based services for children and children ages 6-20 who, absent the RTC Waiver, would require placement in an RTC. This is a five-year waiver, beginning in Federal FY08 (October 1, 2007) and ending in June 30, 2012. There are approximately 70 slots available per region. As of November 30, 2010, there are 107 children enrolled in the RTC Waiver with 71 applications in process and 66 children on the waiting list.
2. **MD CARES and Rural CARES - Systems of Care (SOC) Grants:** In September 2008, the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) awarded Maryland a Children's Mental Health Initiative Cooperative Agreement, commonly referred to as a SOC grant award (see SAMHSA RFA No. SM-08-004). Maryland's project, entitled Maryland Crisis and At Risk for Escalation diversion Services for children (MD CARES), will cement a cross-agency partnership that blends family-driven, evidence-based practices within mental health and child welfare to better serve children and families involved in the State's foster care system.

For MD CARES, service dollars awarded under this cooperative agreement are targeted to the neighborhoods in Baltimore City where the majority of the children and families in foster care reside. For Rural CARES, funding is targeted to the Eastern Shore region encompassing the following nine Counties: Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico and Worcester. The service focus of these initiatives

---

<sup>24</sup> PRTF is the same as an RTC in Maryland.

is the care management and treatment of children in the foster care system, at the point of initial diagnosis of serious emotional disability, in order to prevent out-of-home placement or disruption in current placement when the disability is expected to last in excess of one year.

As previously discussed, DHR is in the process of rolling out Statewide application of Maryland's Family Centered Case Practice Model. The implementation of Family Involvement Team Meetings (FIMs) is a core component of family family-centered practice models. FIMs Team Meetings will be convened by the local departments of social services when:

- a. A child is at imminent risk of removal from home and entry into foster care;
- b. There appears to be a need for change in placement; and/or
- c. There appears to be a need for change in the permanency plan.

These meetings will involve birth parents, extended family members and other participants who play a key role in the child's life. Throughout this process, family members will be engaged from a strength-based perspective.

By referring children to the CME from the FIM Team Meetings, MD CARES and Rural CARES will combine the best practices within both mental health and child welfare through the application of the Wraparound service delivery process for children who have been identified during DHR FIMs Team Meetings to have serious mental health needs and require community support services in order to:

- a. Avoid initial foster home placement;
- b. Stabilize the initial placement to avoid disruption in placement; and/or
- c. Divert from higher level placement or group care.

MD CARES and Rural CARES will serve up to 40 children at a time for an average of 15 months with a projected total of 340 children throughout the project. Through a solid infrastructure and carefully planned Statewide strategies, MD CARES and Rural CARES will also seek to bring the foster care model first developed in Baltimore City for Statewide implementation. Rural CARES is targeting referrals to begin in January 2011. The contractor will be required to comply with the requirements of this grant.

- 3. DHR Group Home Diversion:** Directly aligned with the Children's Cabinet's SOC efforts is DHR's Statewide Place Matters Initiative, which promotes safety, family strengthening, permanency and community-based services for children and families in the child welfare system in the least restrictive settings. As part of its Place Matters child welfare reform initiative, services are provided to divert DHR-involved children from group care settings into family care to achieve permanency. There are 25 slots available for this population in each CME region.

- 4. DJS Out-of-Home Placement Diversion:** Services are provided to children ages 13-18 who have been committed to the care and custody of DJS and who are:
- a. Identified by the Court to be at-risk for an out-of-home community residential placement (group home); or
  - b. In pending placement status in a detention facility or in the community; or
  - c. In a detention facility and likely to be identified to be in-need of an out-of-home placement; or
  - d. In an out-of-home placement (in-state State or out-of State).

Children are referred to the CME by DJS, with the determination of eligibility based on residency and the criteria outlined above. These children are to be served in the community in a family setting. DJS will not refer children to the CME who are unable to be served in the community for safety reasons or who do not have any viable family living arrangements. Children are served for six to nine months, with a maximum length of service of twelve months under certain circumstances with prior written approval received from DJS prior to the start of the ninth month of service.

There are 25 slots available in each CME region for this population. **Community Services Initiative and Rehab Option:** The Community Services Initiative (CSI) program provides funding to divert or return children from out-of-State placements and in-State residential placements. In order to be eligible to receive CSI services, the child must have an open case and currently be receiving services from a Lead Agency; and, there must be a determination that the child's needs can be met without Children's Cabinet funding after a period of two (2) years, based upon:

- a. A clinical assessment that the child's needs for the services included in the community-based service plan will substantially diminish within a two-year period; or
- b. The documented commitment of the child's lead agency, or other agencies or funding sources, to assume responsibility for the funding and implementation of the child's plan of care after two (2) years.

**5. The Rehab Option program** provides funding for services for children if the child:

- a. Meets the eligibility criteria in COMAR 14.31.08.03, and Meets one of the priorities for funding as noted in COMAR 14.31.08.05, and
- b. Funding is available.  
Specifically, a children may be eligible for these funds if he or she is not in the custody of the State, with a mental illness or a developmental disability, and :
- a. Is in an out-of-home placement and has been recommended for discharge but the child's family is unwilling or unable to have the child return home; or

- b. Remains in the home but the child's family is unable to provide appropriate care for the child without additional services and the child is at risk of requiring an out-of-home placement or the treating professionals have recommended an out-of-home placement.

New participant enrollments for both programs were suspended in 2009. The CMEs “inherited” active cases for children whose services were funded by CSI and Rehab Option. Each child was reassessed by the CME for possible enrollment into one of the other above-mentioned funding streams.

**Place Matters** - As one of its administrative functions, the CME will work closely with the staff of DHR and LDSS to support the work of the FIM in order to serve children and children in family settings that are consistent with their permanency plans. Specifically, the CME will have a Community Resource Specialist (two per CME region) available to attend the FIM to identify individualized services and supports in the community that will meet goals within the children’s plan of care in order to achieve his or her permanency plan. If the necessary services are not available in the community, the CME shall work with community providers to create a support to address the need. In addition, the CME shall broker the services and supports and manage the utilization of services and supports to ensure that children are utilizing the appropriate amount and duration of service, are not “stuck” in inappropriate services, and that services/supports are leading to measurable outcomes. The CME will not be responsible for actual payment for the brokered services. The payment function will be with the LDSS.

## **II. *Single Point of Entry***

The GOC serves as a single point of entry (SPE) for prospective providers who wish to establish residential child care programs, and current providers who wish to expand existing residential child care programs. Through this process GOC coordinates the licensing process for residential child care programs for Maryland State child-serving agencies.

SB 782 was passed during the 2008 legislative session and changed the way in which proposals can be accepted for residential child care programs to be licensed by DHR and DJS (codified as Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services Article, §8-703.1). Effective October 1, 2008, proposals for new programs and expansion of existing programs licensed by those agencies may only be accepted in response to a statement of need. SB 782 does not affect programs licensed by DHMH. The majority of children placed in homes licensed by DHMH are placed by DHR and DJS and it is unlikely that new homes licensed by DHMH would contract with those agencies unless they have issued a statement of need for such homes. As a result, it is anticipated that there will be a significant drop in the number of potential new providers. The last SPE training was held in July 2010.

### **III. *Evidenced Based Practices (EBPs)***

Child- and family-serving agencies in Maryland have demonstrated a strong commitment to creating systems of care to ensure that children and families receive access to services and supports that are home- and community-based, culturally and linguistically competent, individualized, effective, and family-driven and children-guided. This is done by enhancing service delivery systems through a focus on outcomes, fidelity, fiscal impact, and evidence-based practices and promising service delivery frameworks and promoting opportunities for healthy development and learning. Supported by the Children's Cabinet's Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan, the Child and Adolescent Innovations Institute developed the Evidence Based Practices (EBP) Center (The Center) as an interdisciplinary resource, training, technical assistance and research hub for Maryland's Children's Cabinet. The Center assists the Children's Cabinet in supporting the implementation and outcomes monitoring of EBPs designed to help children and families who face a broad range of problems, and are involved with different agencies across the State. Utilizing implementation science, the Center is tasked with:

- Developing a methodology for new implementation and expansion of EBPs;
- Providing implementation support to local jurisdictions and EBP providers;
- Gathering, monitoring, analyzing, and reporting on EBP fidelity, outcomes, and utilization data;
- Assisting the State in identifying financing strategies to support the implementation of EBPs in Maryland; and
- Serving as a liaison between EBP Purveyors, the State of Maryland, local jurisdictions, and local EBP providers.

The Center also worked with the State to identify and prioritize EBPs for implementation in Maryland. The following EBPs were prioritized for the first wave of implementation:

- Multisystemic Therapy (MST)
- Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
- Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC)
- Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT).

Accomplishments:

- The Center partnered with local jurisdictions to support the effective implementation of each of the prioritized EBPs. In FY08 a total of 333 children and families were served by either FFT or MST in Maryland. This number increased to 705 in FY09.
- Three TF-CBT yearlong Learning Collaboratives, a method of learning where clinicians come together to become skilled in current evidence based practices in a given area, have been implemented since 2008 with clinicians in Montgomery County and Baltimore City and DJS. To date 97 clinicians have participated in the TF-CBT Learning Collaboratives.

- MTFC has been implemented in Baltimore and Montgomery Counties. Staff have been hired and trained, foster parents have been recruited and licensed, and children are currently being served.
- Maryland was recently awarded funding for evidence-based home visiting to improve health and development outcomes for young children and strengthen families in at risk communities through the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010. The Notice of Grant Award for Maryland's allocation of \$997,636 was determined by federal formula based on 2008 U.S. census estimates of the percentage of children under age 5 living in poverty. In September 2010, Maryland received notification of a supplemental FY10 award for an additional \$39,071, bringing the total award to \$1,036,707.

#### ***IV. Local Management Boards (LMBs)***

The LMBs serve as the coordinator of collaboration for child and family services. They bring together local child-serving agencies, local child providers, clients of services, families, and other community representatives to empower local stakeholders in addressing the needs of and setting priorities for their communities. There is an LMB in each County and in Baltimore City.

A Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) is established after an LMB conducts a community needs assessment, negotiates with the State, and makes a long-term commitment to produce improved outcomes in one or more the State's eight Results areas for child and family well-being. Maryland's eight Results for child well-being reflect the priorities of the Children's Cabinet and the Governor and provide structure to the work of Maryland's 24 LMBs. Funding from the Children's Cabinet Interagency Fund is used by the LMBs to develop and deliver services which address one or more of the eight Result areas as prioritized by the local jurisdiction.

LMBs continue their work in each of Maryland's 24 jurisdictions, engineering changes in their communities that will result in a better quality of life for children and families. To date, LMBs have:

- led the way in returning and diverting children from out-of-state State placements;
- created interagency services for children at-risk of out-of-home placements;
- increased linkages between public and private agencies serving children and families; and
- served as the coordinating body for many community level grants and initiatives such as, School-Based Health Centers, C-Safe, Children Strategies Initiative, and Healthy Families.



## **Conclusion**

The Children's Cabinet remains committed to the development of local, integrated systems of care that ensure that children and their families are served in a culturally and linguistically competent manner, that services are community-based and individualized, and that decisions are child-guided and family-driven. In order to achieve these principles, additional resources must be targeted for underserved areas and a renewed focus must be placed on the identification of resources that meet the needs of the families, children, agencies, and community members involved in the care of children.

The data presented in this Plan makes it abundantly clear that the majority of resources reside in the central region of the State. A regional approach to resource development that includes partnership with family members and children is the most efficient way to promote the adequate and appropriate delivery of services and supports to children in their communities. The development of new residential resources for children should only occur when there is a clearly identified need for the service in a particular jurisdiction or region.

The State continues to make progress in reducing the number of children in out-of-home placements. Now is the time to focus our creative efforts to ensure that those children who are in out-of-home placements are in facilities that are as much like home as possible, meet their individual needs, and are close to their families and communities of origin.

## **Appendix A: Placements by Jurisdiction for All Placement Categories**

Community, Independent Living																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	11	4.4%	0	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	26	10.5%	0	0	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	135	54.4%	0	2	34	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	0.4%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	0.4%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	2	0.8%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	4	1.6%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	1	0.4%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	4	1.6%	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	6	2.4%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.4%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	23	9.3%	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	29	11.7%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	1	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	1	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	2	0.8%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	248	100.0%	0	12	43	123	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	28	33	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	72.7%	23.1%	67.4%	#####	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	78.3%	75.9%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	4.8%	17.3%	49.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	11.3%	13.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Community, RCCP																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	8	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2
Anne Arundel	62	4.9%	0	26	16	2	0	1	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0
Baltimore	139	11.0%	0	4	85	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	16	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0
Baltimore City	487	38.6%	0	5	116	288	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	1	0	5	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4
Calvert	12	1.0%	0	1	0	2	5	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Caroline	4	0.3%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Carroll	15	1.2%	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0
Cecil	18	1.4%	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Charles	20	1.6%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Dorchester	3	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Frederick	42	3.3%	0	0	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	3	0
Garrett	8	0.6%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Harford	50	4.0%	0	1	17	2	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0
Howard	16	1.3%	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	115	9.1%	0	2	25	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3	0	55	5	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	3	0
Prince George's	150	11.9%	0	5	19	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Queen Anne's	3	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Somerset	8	0.6%	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
St. Mary's	21	1.7%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	8	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	1
Talbot	3	0.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	44	3.5%	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	1	0	2	0
Wicomico	17	1.3%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4	0
Worcester	11	0.9%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	0	0
OOS	4	0.3%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1262	100.0%	0	45	334	327	5	9	5	18	21	0	15	14	26	29	2	74	196	2	1	3	3	60	17	9	38	9
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	41.9%	61.2%	59.1%	41.7%	25.0%	33.3%	27.8%	60.0%	0.0%	23.8%	37.5%	24.0%	37.5%	100.0%	47.8%	70.7%	66.7%	12.5%	14.3%	66.7%	61.4%	52.9%	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	3.6%	26.5%	25.9%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	1.4%	1.7%	0.0%	1.2%	1.1%	2.1%	2.3%	0.2%	5.9%	15.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	4.8%	1.3%	0.7%	3.0%	0.7%



Community, LA_CB																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	5	6.6%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Baltimore City	49	64.5%	3	2	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	3
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	2	2.6%	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	1	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	10	13.2%	2	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
Prince George's	6	7.9%	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	2.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	76	100.0%	6	2	8	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	11	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	14	3
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			7.9%	2.6%	10.5%	19.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	14.5%	0.0%	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	18.4%	3.9%

Community, CSLA																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	%of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	1.5%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	6	4.6%	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	32	24.6%	0	0	27	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	7	5.4%	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	3	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	10	7.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	3	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	3	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	7	5.4%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	38	29.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	7	5.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	2	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	3	2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	2	1.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	130	100.0%	2	6	31	10	1	3	10	0	3	0	3	1	1	4	1	39	7	0	1	2	0	3	2	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			100.0%	83.3%	84.4%	71.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	57.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			1.5%	4.6%	23.8%	7.7%	0.8%	2.3%	7.7%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	2.3%	0.8%	0.8%	3.1%	0.8%	30.0%	5.4%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	0.0%	2.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



Family Home, Adoptive																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	3	3.1%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	4	4.1%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	47	48.0%	0	2	13	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	2	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	2	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	2	2.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	5	5.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	5	5.1%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	3	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Montgomery	4	4.1%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Prince George's	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	3	3.1%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	14	14.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	1	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	1	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	98	100.0%	3	2	15	27	1	2	0	4	2	2	2	5	3	1	0	2	2	2	0	4	0	13	0	0	6	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	48.9%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	92.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			3.1%	2.0%	15.3%	27.6%	1.0%	2.0%	0.0%	4.1%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	5.1%	3.1%	1.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%

Family Home, FosterCare																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	53	3.6%	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Anne Arundel	40	2.7%	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Baltimore	99	6.8%	0	0	78	3	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Baltimore City	581	39.8%	0	16	121	375	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	26	13	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4
Calvert	20	1.4%	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	13	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	15	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cecil	54	3.7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
Charles	49	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	4	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	58	4.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1
Garrett	18	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Harford	67	4.6%	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Howard	14	1.0%	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	5	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	132	9.0%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	110	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0
Prince George's	92	6.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Queen Anne's	9	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	10	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
St. Mary's	24	1.6%	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Talbot	5	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0
Washington	72	4.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	15	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Worcester	7	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	4	0.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1460	100.0%	51	53	207	380	23	14	24	52	50	3	52	18	91	33	5	113	95	11	11	18	3	82	18	6	36	11
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			96.2%	92.5%	78.8%	64.5%	100.0%	100.0%	93.3%	90.7%	95.9%	75.0%	84.5%	94.4%	91.0%	78.6%	100.0%	83.3%	85.9%	100.0%	90.0%	70.8%	20.0%	100.0%	93.3%	85.7%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			3.5%	3.6%	14.2%	26.0%	1.6%	1.0%	1.6%	3.6%	3.4%	0.2%	3.6%	1.2%	6.2%	2.3%	0.3%	7.7%	6.5%	0.8%	0.8%	1.2%	0.2%	5.6%	1.2%	0.4%	2.5%	0.8%



Family Home, Individual Family Care																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

Family Home, LA\_FH

Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed

Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	7	1.5%	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Anne Arundel	6	1.3%	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	31	6.7%	0	0	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Baltimore City	238	51.1%	0	7	31	173	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	9	1.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	4	0.9%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	6	1.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Garrett	4	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	27	5.8%	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Howard	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	3	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	48	10.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0
Prince George's	54	11.6%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	44	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	16	3.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	1	0
Wicomico	6	1.3%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Worcester	4	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	466	100.0%	6	10	54	189	0	1	2	12	5	1	5	4	20	2	3	39	55	0	1	2	1	19	5	2	13	15
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			85.7%	50.0%	54.8%	72.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%	0.0%	66.7%	100.0%	59.3%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	81.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			1.3%	2.1%	11.6%	40.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	2.6%	1.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.9%	4.3%	0.4%	0.6%	8.4%	11.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	4.1%	1.1%	0.4%	2.8%	3.2%



Family Home, Relative Care																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	26	1.1%	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
Anne Arundel	20	0.9%	0	12	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Baltimore	95	4.1%	0	0	50	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1
Baltimore City	1772	76.6%	0	67	263	1305	0	0	4	8	1	3	1	0	19	21	0	2	8	0	0	1	0	3	2	1	47	16
Calvert	17	0.7%	0	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	7	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Carroll	2	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	17	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0
Charles	17	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	27	1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Garrett	6	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Harford	69	3.0%	0	1	7	5	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	41	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
Howard	6	0.3%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	110	4.8%	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	77	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0
Prince George's	76	3.3%	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	61	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
Queen Anne's	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	2	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
St. Mary's	19	0.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Washington	18	0.8%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	3	0
Wicomico	4	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	2	0.1%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	2314	100.0%	21	83	326	1344	17	2	10	21	24	7	30	4	75	29	0	87	89	1	1	18	0	19	7	2	77	20
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			80.8%	60.0%	52.6%	73.6%	82.4%	28.6%	100.0%	52.9%	94.1%	0.0%	85.2%	66.7%	59.4%	33.3%	0.0%	70.0%	80.3%	0.0%	50.0%	73.7%	0.0%	66.7%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.9%	3.6%	14.1%	58.1%	0.7%	0.1%	0.4%	0.9%	1.0%	0.3%	1.3%	0.2%	3.2%	1.3%	0.0%	3.8%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%	0.1%	3.3%	0.9%

Family Home Settings, All Subcategories																												
Placement Jurisdiction																												
Home Jurisdiction	# of placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	99	1.5%	88	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
Anne Arundel	92	1.4%	0	63	8	5	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Baltimore	400	6.2%	0	8	214	101	0	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	31	8	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	10	2
Baltimore City	3966	61.1%	0	128	775	2551	0	0	22	12	28	4	4	1	110	83	0	9	121	0	1	2	0	8	2	1	70	34
Calvert	50	0.8%	0	1	0	0	38	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Caroline	26	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Carroll	19	0.3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cecil	105	1.6%	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	76	0	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	7	1
Charles	86	1.3%	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dorchester	16	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Frederick	119	1.8%	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	81	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	3	1
Garrett	38	0.6%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Harford	212	3.3%	0	1	21	23	1	0	1	14	0	1	2	0	134	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	0
Howard	36	0.6%	0	1	4	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kent	14	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Montgomery	387	6.0%	0	4	12	9	2	0	6	0	3	0	9	2	0	7	0	266	42	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	11	0
Prince George's	428	6.6%	0	5	4	9	6	0	1	0	26	0	0	0	1	4	0	23	329	0	0	5	0	1	1	0	13	0
Queen Anne's	20	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Somerset	37	0.6%	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	2	0	15	2	0	0
St. Mary's	78	1.2%	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	3	1	0	3	8	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	3
Talbot	17	0.3%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	1	
Washington	143	2.2%	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	122	0	0	5	0
Wicomico	62	1.0%	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	40	2	0	0
Worcester	35	0.5%	0	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	9	12	1	0
OOS	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Unknown	6	0.1%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	6492	100.0%	93	215	1044	2733	54	30	60	106	155	33	99	46	290	128	13	303	524	26	24	46	8	179	79	17	141	46
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			88.9%	68.5%	53.5%	64.3%	76.0%	73.1%	84.2%	72.4%	83.7%	56.3%	68.1%	89.5%	63.2%	50.0%	71.4%	68.7%	76.9%	70.0%	35.1%	44.9%	17.6%	85.3%	64.5%	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			1.4%	3.3%	16.1%	42.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.9%	1.6%	2.4%	0.5%	1.5%	0.7%	4.5%	2.0%	0.2%	4.7%	8.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	2.8%	1.2%	0.3%	2.2%	0.7%



Family Home, TFC																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	10	0.5%	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	26	1.2%	0	11	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	171	7.9%	0	8	67	62	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	15	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	0
Baltimore City	1328	61.7%	0	36	347	675	0	0	13	2	26	1	2	1	59	47	0	7	102	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	4	0
Calvert	13	0.6%	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Caroline	3	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Carroll	2	0.1%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	24	1.1%	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Charles	15	0.7%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	10	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Frederick	26	1.2%	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Garrett	5	0.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	44	2.0%	0	0	5	14	0	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	15	0.7%	0	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	3	0.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	93	4.3%	0	3	11	6	1	0	3	0	2	0	3	1	0	2	0	41	13	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	1	0
Prince George's	205	9.5%	0	4	3	5	6	0	1	0	23	0	0	0	1	4	0	12	145	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	10	0.5%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Somerset	25	1.2%	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	14	1	0	0
St. Mary's	32	1.5%	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	10	0.5%	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0
Washington	23	1.1%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	37	1.7%	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	19	2	0	0
Worcester	23	1.1%	0	0	1	4	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4	0	0
OOS	1	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	2154	100.0%	12	67	442	793	13	11	24	17	74	20	10	15	101	63	5	62	283	12	11	4	4	46	49	7	9	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			70.0%	42.3%	39.2%	50.8%	30.8%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	40.0%	11.5%	80.0%	34.1%	26.7%	66.7%	44.1%	70.7%	50.0%	12.0%	6.3%	10.0%	56.5%	51.4%	17.4%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.6%	3.1%	20.5%	36.8%	0.6%	0.5%	1.1%	0.8%	3.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	4.7%	2.9%	0.2%	2.9%	13.1%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	2.1%	2.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%

Hospital, In Patient																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	1	16.7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	2	33.3%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	1	16.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Washington	2	33.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	6	100.0%	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%

Hospital, Psychiatric																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	2	8.3%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	1	4.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	10	41.7%	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	2	8.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Frederick	1	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	1	4.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	1	4.2%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	3	12.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	1	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	1	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	24	100.0%	0	1	6	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	2
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	4.2%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%	0.0%	16.7%	8.3%



**Non-Community Based Residential Programs, All Subcategories**  
**Placement Jurisdiction**

Home Jurisdiction	# of placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	19	1.2%	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
Anne Arundel	106	6.9%	3	48	15	7	1	4	1	4	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1
Baltimore	167	10.9%	1	2	88	28	0	4	9	4	1	2	8	2	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	0
Baltimore City	374	24.3%	4	12	79	203	0	3	11	2	1	3	8	0	2	4	1	4	2	0	3	0	0	7	0	0	22	6
Calvert	25	1.6%	0	1	4	1	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	0
Caroline	17	1.1%	2	0	2	3	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	38	2.5%	4	0	8	3	0	0	16	1	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Cecil	36	2.3%	3	1	7	2	0	1	0	10	1	0	3	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Charles	36	2.3%	1	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0
Dorchester	16	1.0%	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Frederick	68	4.4%	3	0	8	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	41	0	0	1	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Garrett	12	0.8%	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	44	2.9%	0	2	8	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	0	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Howard	36	2.3%	1	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kent	9	0.6%	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Montgomery	181	11.8%	4	0	14	12	0	6	1	2	0	1	16	1	2	2	0	108	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	0
Prince George's	172	11.2%	1	3	30	11	0	2	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	2	1	9	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1
Queen Anne's	10	0.7%	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	9	0.6%	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	21	1.4%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	0
Talbot	12	0.8%	2	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	50	3.3%	2	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	3	0
Wicomico	30	2.0%	1	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
Worcester	13	0.8%	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0
OOS	37	2.4%	0	4	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	8	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1538	100.0%	49	80	304	300	10	35	42	27	18	27	130	10	28	27	7	147	96	2	6	16	2	39	16	9	103	8
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in			31.6%	45.3%	52.7%	54.3%	36.0%	41.2%	42.1%	27.8%	33.3%	37.5%	60.3%	41.7%	31.8%	33.3%	0.0%	59.7%	49.4%	20.0%	33.3%	57.1%	16.7%	58.0%	46.7%	69.2%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			3.2%	5.2%	19.8%	19.5%	0.7%	2.3%	2.7%	1.8%	1.2%	1.8%	8.5%	0.7%	1.8%	1.8%	0.5%	9.6%	6.2%	0.1%	0.4%	1.0%	0.1%	2.5%	1.0%	0.6%	6.7%	0.5%



NonCommunity, Detention																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	0.7%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	14	5.0%	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Baltimore	15	5.4%	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Baltimore City	100	36.0%	1	5	9	56	0	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	5	6
Calvert	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Cecil	4	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	6	2.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	5	1.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Frederick	9	3.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	3	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	4	1.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	28	10.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	47	16.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	9	3.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	14	5.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	6	2.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
Worcester	3	1.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
OOS	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	278	100.0%	3	14	22	58	2	0	5	3	6	4	10	8	4	5	2	30	44	0	4	8	0	19	7	3	9	8
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			100.0%	64.3%	73.3%	56.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	75.0%	66.7%	80.0%	88.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	96.4%	87.2%	0.0%	100.0%	88.9%	0.0%	92.9%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			1.1%	5.0%	7.9%	20.9%	0.7%	0.0%	1.8%	1.1%	2.2%	1.4%	3.6%	2.9%	1.4%	1.8%	0.7%	10.8%	15.8%	0.0%	1.4%	2.9%	0.0%	6.8%	2.5%	1.1%	3.2%	2.9%

NonCommunity, ASAM																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	2	0.4%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	34	7.2%	3	19	0	5	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	57	12.0%	1	1	30	12	0	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	132	27.8%	3	2	3	109	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Calvert	8	1.7%	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	10	2.1%	2	0	0	2	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	19	4.0%	4	0	0	2	0	0	8	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	14	3.0%	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	7	1.5%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	2	0.4%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	9	1.9%	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	1	0.2%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	16	3.4%	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	8	1.7%	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	4	0.8%	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	42	8.9%	4	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	1	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	30	6.3%	1	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	7	1.5%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	0.8%	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	2	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	5	1.1%	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	17	3.6%	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	9	1.9%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Worcester	5	1.1%	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
OOS	30	6.3%	0	4	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	474	100.0%	43	31	33	167	4	4	30	3	6	10	33	0	21	13	5	20	24	1	0	6	1	12	5	2	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			50.0%	55.9%	52.6%	82.6%	37.5%	40.0%	42.1%	14.3%	42.9%	0.0%	44.4%	0.0%	56.3%	50.0%	0.0%	47.6%	63.3%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%	20.0%	47.1%	44.4%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			9.1%	6.5%	7.0%	35.2%	0.8%	0.8%	6.3%	0.6%	1.3%	2.1%	7.0%	0.0%	4.4%	2.7%	1.1%	4.2%	5.1%	0.2%	0.0%	1.3%	0.2%	2.5%	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%



NonCommunity, LA\_NCB

Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed

Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

NonCommunity, DETP																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	2	13.3%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	3	20.0%	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	1	6.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	3	20.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	2	13.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	4	26.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	15	100.0%	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



# NonCommunity, NonSecure

## Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed

Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	4	17.4%	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore	3	13.0%	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Baltimore City	4	17.4%	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calvert	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	1	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	1	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	1	4.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	3	13.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prince George's	4	17.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Mary's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wicomico	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OOS	2	8.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	23	100.0%	0	4	2	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	17.4%	8.7%	21.7%	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	26.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

NonCommunity, Residential Education																													
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																													
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown	
Allegany	11	3.8%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	
Anne Arundel	24	8.4%	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	
Baltimore	33	11.5%	0	0	6	3	0	3	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	
Baltimore City	33	11.5%	0	0	6	2	0	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	
Calvert	8	2.8%	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
Caroline	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	4	1.4%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	6	2.1%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Charles	12	4.2%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
Dorchester	2	0.7%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Frederick	16	5.6%	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Garrett	2	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	12	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	
Howard	14	4.9%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
Kent	3	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Montgomery	54	18.8%	0	0	10	2	0	6	0	2	0	0	12	0	0	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	
Prince George's	40	13.9%	0	0	11	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	6	2.1%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Washington	5	1.7%	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	
Wicomico	1	0.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Worcester	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	287	100.0%	0	0	55	15	0	28	0	16	0	0	47	0	0	6	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	94	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	6.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	5.2%	0.0%	9.8%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	32.8%	0.0%	



NonCommunity, RTC																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	4	0.9%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Anne Arundel	30	6.5%	0	16	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore	57	12.4%	0	1	37	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Baltimore City	102	22.1%	0	5	61	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Calvert	7	1.5%	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Caroline	5	1.1%	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Carroll	11	2.4%	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Cecil	12	2.6%	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Charles	11	2.4%	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dorchester	7	1.5%	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Frederick	30	6.5%	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Garrett	6	1.3%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Harford	14	3.0%	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Howard	10	2.2%	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kent	2	0.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Montgomery	52	11.3%	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Prince George's	47	10.2%	0	3	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Queen Anne's	3	0.7%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Somerset	4	0.9%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
St. Mary's	4	0.9%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Talbot	7	1.5%	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Washington	14	3.0%	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	
Wicomico	14	3.0%	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	
Worcester	5	1.1%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	
OOS	3	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total	461	100.0%	3	31	190	52	4	2	5	5	6	13	36	2	3	3	0	67	18	1	2	2	1	8	3	4	0	0
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			75.0%	53.3%	64.9%	28.4%	57.1%	20.0%	45.5%	41.7%	45.5%	28.6%	60.0%	33.3%	21.4%	20.0%	0.0%	86.5%	36.2%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	14.3%	57.1%	21.4%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.7%	6.7%	41.2%	11.3%	0.9%	0.4%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	2.8%	7.8%	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	14.5%	3.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	1.7%	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%

Unknown, Unknown																												
Jurisdiction Where Children were Placed																												
Home Jurisdiction	# placements from jurisdiction	% of placements statewide from Jurisdiction	Allegany	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Baltimore City	Calvert	Caroline	Carroll	Cecil	Charles	Dorchester	Frederick	Garrett	Harford	Howard	Kent	Montgomery	Prince George's	Queen Anne's	Somerset	St. Mary's	Talbot	Washington	Wicomico	Worcester	OOS	Unknown
Allegany	1	0.2%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anne Arundel	8	1.8%	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Baltimore	13	3.0%	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Baltimore City	326	74.6%	0	3	24	91	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	9	185
Calvert	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caroline	3	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Carroll	1	0.2%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cecil	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Charles	4	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dorchester	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frederick	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Garrett	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harford	6	1.4%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Howard	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	22	5.0%	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
Prince George's	30	6.9%	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10
Queen Anne's	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	4	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
St. Mary's	4	0.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Talbot	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Wicomico	3	0.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Worcester	2	0.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
OOS	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	1	0.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total	437	100.0%	1	5	35	98	0	0	2	0	6	3	1	0	5	3	2	7	26	1	2	0	0	3	6	0	13	218
% of placements from jurisdiction placed in jurisdiction			100.0%	25.0%	30.8%	27.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%	50.0%	27.3%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
% of placements statewide by placement jurisdiction (total)			0.2%	1.1%	8.0%	22.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	1.4%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%	1.6%	5.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	1.4%	0.0%	3.0%	49.9%



## **Appendix B: Capacity and Utilization by Placement Category & Agency**

## FY 2010 Capacity Utilization

### One-Day Census

This one-day census is a summary of participating providers in relation to placements on January 31, 2010 as reported by the agencies excluding DDA. The list is separated into the five macro-placement categories including the unknown category and further sorted by the sub-category and reporting agency.

#### Community-Based Residential Placement

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
Independent Living	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families – Future bound IL Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	8	0	16	21	Montgomery	6	DHR
Independent Living	Wellington Incorporated	Wellington Inc -- Kindness House ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	13	0	16	21	Prince George's	10	DHR
Independent Living	Transition Living Services, Inc.	Transition Living Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	50	0	16	21	Prince George's	23	DHR
Independent Living	New Pathways, Inc.	New Pathways -- Independence Plus CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	75	0	16	21	Baltimore City	56	DHR
Independent Living	New Pathways, Inc.	New Pathways -- Second Generations CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	18	0	16	21	Baltimore City	20	DHR
Independent Living	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Independent Living Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	30	0	18	21	Baltimore City	26	DHR
Independent Living	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Community Services, Inc. TAY Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	12	0	16	21	Baltimore	10	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
Independent Living	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers Independent Living	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	50	0	16	21	Baltimore	26	DHR
Independent Living	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Damamli Independent Living	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	25	0	18	21	Baltimore	21	DHR
Independent Living	King Edwards' Inc.	King Edwards' Inc. ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	30	0	16	21	Baltimore City	27	DHR
Independent Living	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Independent Living Program	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	15	0	16	21	Baltimore City	12	DHR
Independent Living	Umbrella Therapeutic Services, Inc.	Umbrella Therapeutic Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	20	0	18	20	Prince George's	7	DHR
Independent Living	Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington, Inc.	Catholic Charities DC ILP	DHR	CPA: Independent Living	24	0	0	21	Prince George's	13	DHR
Independent Living	Adelphoi Village	Adelphoi Village Specialized Independent Living Program			0	0	16	19	OOS	1	DJS
Independent Living	National Center for Children and Families	Future Bound Independent Living Program	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	21	21	16	20	Montgomery	9	DJS
Independent Living	Alternatives for Youth and Families	Alternatives for Youth and Families Phase II, III	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	10	0	16	21	St. Mary's	2	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
Independent Living	Mentor Maryland Network	Mentor Maryland - Baltimore Teens In Transition - Supervised Apartment Living-IL	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	0	20	18	21	Baltimore	1	DJS
Independent Living	New Pathways, Inc	New Pathways- Independence Plus	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	0	64	17	21	Baltimore City	1	DJS
Independent Living	Mosaic Community Services, Inc	Transition Age Youth Program (TAY)	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	12	12	17	21	Baltimore	1	DJS
Independent Living	Hearts & Homes For Youth	Damamli Independent Living Program	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	24	24	16	21	Baltimore	3	DJS
Independent Living	Jumoke, Inc	Jumoke - Independent Living	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	20	20	16	21	Baltimore City	1	DJS
LA_CB	Public Provider	Public Provider			0	0	0	0		76	DHR
RCCP	Compassion Inc.	Compassion, Inc. Oakland	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	16	19	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Cumberland Hospital	Cumberland Hospital Facility	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Grafton School	Grafton Group Home	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	0	20	OOS	4	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Mid Atlantic Youth Services-Luzerne Co. Juv Ctr	Mid Atlantic Youth Services	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	1	1	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc.	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc. -- Gwynn Oak House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	18	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Bridgewater	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	10	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	10	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	Camelot	Camelot	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	1	1	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Carlton Palms	Carlton Palms	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	1	1	0	21	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Unknown	Unknown			0	0	0	0		44	DHR
RCCP	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Center - Diagnostic	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	16	12	17	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt High Intensity Adolescent Respite Program	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	34	24	11	21	Baltimore	12	DHR
RCCP	AdvoServ	AdvoServ Group Homes	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	0	20	OOS	25	DHR
RCCP	Bennington School	Bennington School Group Home	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	3	3	0	19	OOS	1	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	San Marcos	San Marcos	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	0	21	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Devereux National	Devereux Florida	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	The Pines	The Pines Group Homes	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	25	25	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Woods Services	The Woods School Devante Thomas	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	1	1	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Woods Services	The Woods Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc. Maine	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	12	12	13	17	Baltimore City	10	DHR
RCCP	The Marlene B. Vinson Home Of New Beginnings, Inc.	Marlene B. Vinson Adolescent - Home Of New Beginnings	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	12	12	12	18	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Marys Mount Manor Girls DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	17	Anne Arundel	4	DHR
RCCP	Mumsey's Residential Care, Inc.	Mumsey's Residential Care - Devonshire	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	20	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Trimir Home for Children and Families, Inc.	Trimir Home for Children and Families - Woodside	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	7	15	19	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Hebron Association for Community Services Inc.	Hebron Association - Philomen's Place -- Bauer	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Montgomery	3	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Center for Social Change, Inc	Center for Social Change Springdell	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	9	21	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Long Term Care Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	48	48	13	20	Baltimore	22	DHR
RCCP	Creative Options, Inc.	Creative Options -- Scarborough	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	2	2	17	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Transitional Living	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	8	8	13	17	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Shelter Program	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	8	8	13	17	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Dublin	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	16	19	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	F & N Children's Youth Home, Inc.	F & N Children's Youth Home -- Justin Way	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	14	17	Montgomery	4	DHR
RCCP	GUIDE Program, Inc.	GUIDE DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	4	6	13	18	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	Florida Institute for Neurologic Rehabilitation	Florida Institute for Neurologic Rehab Facility	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	0	20	OOS	2	DHR
RCCP	San Mar Children`s Home, Inc.	San Mar Jack E Barr DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	18	Washington	5	DHR
RCCP	North American Family Institute, Inc.	North American Family Institute Jane Egerton House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	12	13	21	Baltimore City	4	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Eveshem	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	17	19	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Main Campus Gaither Rd	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	85	85	9	21	Baltimore	74	DHR
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Children's Home and School, Inc.	Cedar Ridge Children's Home DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	11	17	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	Aries Residential Services Incorporated	Aries Residential Services	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	18	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Project Diagnostic Center RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	45	45	12	18	Baltimore	38	DHR
RCCP	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities St Vincents Child Care Center	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	70	70	3	13	Baltimore	63	DHR
RCCP	Aunt Hattie`s Place, Inc.	Aunt Hattie's Place, Inc Shenton	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	19	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers Bert Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	19	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	The Benedictine School For Exceptional Children, Incorporated	Benedictine Lane	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	50	95	5	21	Caroline	8	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Girls Boys Shelter	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	24	24	9	18	Baltimore	12	DHR



Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Nicodemus	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Children's Home and School, Inc.	Cedar Ridge Children's Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	24	24	6	21	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	Children's Resources, Inc	Children's Resources, Inc - Shining Tree	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	14	14	12	16	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Rosemont	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	16	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Wild Cherry	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	5	13	16	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Franklin Group Homes, Incorporated	Franklin Group Homes, Inc - Lorraine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	5	15	18	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Helen Smith Girls Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	14	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Jumoke, Inc.	Jumoke, Inc. Gwynn	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	18	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Linwood Center, Inc.	Linwood Center	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	2	4	4	21	Howard	5	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	McJoy's Joy Covenant Inc.	McJoy's Joy Covenant	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	15	18	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	13	18	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Shoshone Way	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	17	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	The Place for Children, Incorporated	Place for Children	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	13	16	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	The Place for Children, Incorporated	Place for Children	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	12	15	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Clarks	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	20	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Meadow	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	20	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Rocky	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Silver	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Brigadoon	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Starflight Enterprises, Inc.	Starflight Quiet Hours	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	20	Howard	1	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Alternatives for Youth & Families, Inc.	Alternatives for Youth & Families Lighthouse DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	12	17	Charles	2	DHR
RCCP	Trimir Home for Children and Families, Inc.	Trimir Home for Children and Families	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	19	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	16	21	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	14	17	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	9	9	16	20	Baltimore City	8	DHR
RCCP	Tuttie`s Place	Tuttie's Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	15	19	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	United States Fellowship, Inc.	United States Fellowship	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	14	14	14	18	Washington	1	DHR
RCCP	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities Villa Maria TGH DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	9	14	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Bald Hill	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	6	8	10	14	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Boykin	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	7	13	16	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	CSAAC	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	7	21	Montgomery	1	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Oxon Hill	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	15	20	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc.	Maple Shade Mardela Special Care DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	8	18	Wicomico	6	DHR
RCCP	Maryland Sheriffs' Youth Ranch, Inc.	Maryland Sheriffs' Youth Ranch - Frederick	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	20	18	10	18	Frederick	9	DHR
RCCP	Good Children in the Making, Inc.	Good Children in the Making - Della's House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	7	15	19	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	17	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	17	21	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	18	20	Baltimore	4	DHR
RCCP	Making A Great Individual Contribution, Inc.	MAGIC Purnell	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	18	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	The Marlene B. Vinson Home Of New Beginnings, Inc.	Marlene B. Vinson - Pregnant Teens & Teen Mother Program	DHR	RCC: Teen Mothers Program	4	4	16	21	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	The Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	24	24	6	18	Garrett	10	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	National Residential Services, Inc.	National Residential Services - Cherry Hill	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	17	20	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Ingalls	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	National Residential Services, Inc.	National Residential Services - Sandy Spring	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	17	20	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	San Mar Children's Home, Inc.	San Mar Children's Home, Inc Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	25	14	12	18	Washington	4	DHR
RCCP	Sarah's House, Inc.	Sarah's House I	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	6	17	20	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Sarah's House, Inc.	Sarah's House II	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	18	21	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	Structures Youth Home, Inc.	Structures Youth Home, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	16	20	Charles	6	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Pine Valley	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	2	DHR
RCCP	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. - Mason	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	15	18	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. - Stratford	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	18	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Vanderlyn	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	3	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Short Cut	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	3	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	JS Social Services, Inc (Youthtown)	JS Social Services -- Youthtown USA I - 517	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	4	4	15	18	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	Brotherhood and Sisterhood (BSI) International	Brotherhood and Sisterhood -- Blueridge	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Community Services for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.	CSAAC Horizon Run	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	12	21	Montgomery	2	DHR
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven Park Towne	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	6	16	Cecil	4	DHR
RCCP	Center for Social Change, Inc	Center for Social Change MFP Chapman	DDA	RCC: Medically Fragile	5	5	3	21	Baltimore	5	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance Seth DDA	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	6	12	16	Prince George's	6	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance 16515 Governor Bridge #103	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	14	18	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	14	17	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	16	20	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	2	6	Prince George's	2	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Benton	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Forest View	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	20	Anne Arundel	1	DHR
RCCP	The ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc	ARC of the Central Chesapeake Region, Inc Main	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	3	DHR
RCCP	Boyz II Men Youth Program, Inc.	Boyz II Men Youth Program - Brockton	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	14	18	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1E	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	9	20	Anne Arundel	1	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1A	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	15	19	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1D	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	19	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	LifeLine Inc.	LifeLine 1F	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	20	Anne Arundel	2	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Mac II DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	12	18	Howard	6	DHR
RCCP	GUIDE Program, Inc.	GUIDE Barrington DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	4	6	13	18	Baltimore City	1	DHR
RCCP	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Redl House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	7	8	12	17	Montgomery	1	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Mac I DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	12	18	Howard	5	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Dulaney House DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Howard	5	DHR
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc.	Mosaic Fordham Cottage DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore	7	DHR
RCCP	Day By Day Residential Services, Inc.	Day By Day Residential Services - Oakfield	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	17	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Devine Interventions, Inc.	Devine Intervention - Northwood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	14	17	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	National Deaf Academy	National Deaf Academy Group Home	OOS	RCC: Large Group Home	1	1	0	20	OOS	1	DHR
RCCP	Changing Lives at Home, Inc.	Changing Lives At Home, Inc.	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	19	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	National Youth Ministries Alliance Inc.	National Youth Ministries Alliance	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	14	17	Prince George's	1	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc.	All That Matters -- Rhodena Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	18	Prince George's	8	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation	All That Matters Foundation -- Chalfont	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	13	17	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Our Fortress Homes, Inc.	Our Fortress Homes -- Parkside DHMH	DHMH	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	17	Baltimore City	5	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Debuskey House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Kanner House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore City	3	DHR



Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Childrens Guild Harford House DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	18	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Foundations II	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	21	Washington	2	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washjngton County - Jefferson House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	10	17	Washington	3	DHR
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc.	ARC of Washington County - Potomac House - Potomac	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	15	21	Washington	5	DHR
RCCP	Youth-Vision Services, Inc.	Youth-Vision Services - Crandall	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	16	20	Prince George's	6	DHR
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation	All That Matters Foundation -- Bellgreen	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	17	Prince George's	6	DHR
RCCP	Care With Class, Inc.	Care With Class, Inc. - B2	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	15	19	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Care With Class, Inc.	Care With Class, Inc. -A3	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	15	19	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Lazarus House Inc	Lazarus House Inc. - Luzerne	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	17	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Knowledge Empowers You to Succeed, Inc.	Knowledge Empowers You to Succeed - Premiere House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	17	21	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Cottage At Rockville DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	12	21	Montgomery	8	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Cottage At North Potomac DHMH TGH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	7	8	12	17	Montgomery	8	DHR
RCCP	Inspiring Minds Inc.	Inspiring Minds - Gwynn	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	15	18	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family -,Nyanga	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	0	21	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	The Florence Crittenton Services of Baltimore, Inc.	Florence Crittenton Services of Baltimore Inc.	DHR	RCC: Teen Mothers Program	38	38	13	21	Baltimore City	16	DHR
RCCP	Youth Enterprises Services, Inc.	Youth Enterprises Services Inc -- Lincoln House	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	16	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	Transformations, Inc.	Transformations -- Windsor	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	10	10	15	19	Baltimore City	7	DHR
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Spring DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Lehnert DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	21	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Jameson DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Joppa Farm Mentor DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Harford	3	DHR
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Perryhurst DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	16	20	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Rockridge DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Baltimore	2	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Maxwelton DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	14	18	Baltimore	3	DHR
RCCP	The Jentry McDonald Corporation	Jentry McDonald - McCulloh	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	15	15	5	12	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families RCC	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	20	20	12	20	Montgomery	7	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - Nyanga	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	3	3	0	21	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan - Brooks	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	12	16	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home	St. Ann's Infant & Maternity, Inc. Group Home	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	12	109	0	21	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family - Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	4	4	0	21	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Project Transitional Living	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	18	18	16	21	Harford	14	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan -Auth	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	12	16	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family Minna	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	6	0	21	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	Inner-County Outreach Incorporated	Inner-County Outreach - Edgewood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	18	Harford	5	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan Dogwood Lane	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	9	13	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan Sydney Avenue	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	11	15	Prince George's	4	DHR
RCCP	First Metropolitan Facilities Inc.	First Metropolitan - Auth	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	3	12	16	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Inner-County Outreach Incorporated	Inner-County Outreach - Overlea	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	18	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Rolling Vista Place Incorporated	Rolling Vista Place - Wyanoke	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	18	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA Stonewood	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	14	17	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	CIS & H Inc.	CIS & H Inc. Manchester	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	3	6	15	18	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Starrs Group Home, Inc.	Starrs Group Home -- Maine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	6	17	20	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	The Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	Maryland Salem Children's Trust - Shelter	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	8	8	6	18	Garrett	3	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Rolling Road	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	15	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board Of Child Care Colesville Group Home	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	7	18	Montgomery	7	DHR
RCCP	Hebron Association for Community Services Inc.	Hebron Association - Frankfort Dr.	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	8	18	Montgomery	4	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Structures Youth Home, Inc.	Structures Youth Home --	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	7	16	20	Charles	4	DHR
RCCP	Dream Keepers Inc.	Dream Keepers -- Brehms Lane	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	4	15	21	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Dahsi Paradise Home Inc	Dahsi Paradise Home Inc. -- Martha's Place	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	8	8	14	17	Baltimore City	7	DHR
RCCP	REM Maryland, Inc.	REM Maryland Sheerock DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	4	4	0	21	Howard	4	DHR
RCCP	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home -- Diagnostic & Treatment	DHR	RCC: Large Group Home	16	16	13	19	Baltimore	6	DHR
RCCP	JS Social Services, Inc (Youthtown)	JS Social Services - Youthtown USA II - 12 Second	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	16	Anne Arundel	4	DHR
RCCP	We Are The World, Inc.	We Are The World -- Woodbine	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	16	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Second Chance Services Unlimited, Inc.	Second Chance	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	4	4	14	18	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Trivisions Inc.	Trivisions Inc. -- Forest Park	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	7	7	13	17	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Goliven Group Home, Inc.	Goliven Group Homes - St. Georges	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	13	17	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family -- Lancaster	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	5	0	11	Prince George's	5	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	4	4	0	21	Prince George's	4	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Shorehaven, Inc	Shorehaven	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	13	21	Cecil	2	DHR
RCCP	Comfort Homes, Inc.	Comfort Homes -- Overland DDA	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	6	15	19	Baltimore City	2	DHR
RCCP	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care Hagerstown Transitional	DHR	RCC: Shelter Home	6	4	15	19	Washington	3	DHR
RCCP	The KOBA Institute, Inc.	KOBA - Mansion at Focus Point Upper Marlboro	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	4	8	15	19	Prince George's	2	DHR
RCCP	Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc.	Maple Shade Royal Oak DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	4	8	10	18	Wicomico	3	DHR
RCCP	Tender Care	Tender Care	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	5	5	13	18	Wicomico	3	DHR
RCCP	Our Fortress Homes, Inc.	Our Fortress Homes -- Hilton DHMH	DHMH	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	14	18	Baltimore City	8	DHR
RCCP	Creative Options, Inc.	Creative Options	DDA	Alternative Living Unit	2	2	18	21	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	The Okojie Group, Inc.	The Okojie Group, Inc. -- Walnut	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	14	17	Baltimore City	4	DHR
RCCP	Challengers Independent Living, Inc.	Challengers -- Berts Place Too	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	7	15	19	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	Dream Keepers Inc.	Dream Keepers	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	16	21	Baltimore City	5	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Inc.	NCIA St. Andrews	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	3	3	15	19	Baltimore	1	DHR
RCCP	Second Family, Inc.	Second Family	DDA	RCC: Small Group Home	5	5	0	21	Prince George's	3	DHR
RCCP	Dream Keepers Inc.	Dream Keepers -- Montebello Terrace	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	5	6	16	20	Baltimore City	3	DHR
RCCP	Compassion Inc.	Compassion -	DHR	RCC: Small Group Home	6	6	16	19	Baltimore City	6	DHR
RCCP	National Center on Institutions and Alternatives	NCIA -Youth in Transition Program			3	0	0	0	Baltimore	17	DJS
RCCP	San Mar Children's Home Inc	San Mar- Anna Findlay Group Home			23	0	13	18	Washington	7	DJS
RCCP	Adventist Behavioral Health	Potomac Ridge Crownsville Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	16	18	13	18	Anne Arundel	16	DJS
RCCP	Hearts and Homes for Youth, Inc.	Hearts & Homes for Youth- Mary's Mount Manor TGH	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	13	8	13	17	Anne Arundel	4	DJS
RCCP	Guide Programs, Inc.	Guide Ft. Washington Therapeutic Group Home	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	8	6	13	18	Prince George's	3	DJS
RCCP	San Mar Children's Home Inc	San Mar Jack E. Barr Therapeutic Group Home	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	18	Washington	3	DJS
RCCP	North American Family Institute Inc	Jane Egenton House	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	12	12	13	21	Baltimore City	3	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	The Board of Child Care, Inc	The Board of Child Care - Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	104	85	9	21	Baltimore	6	DJS
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Ministries	Cedar Ridge Therapeutic Group Home	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	11	17	Washington	4	DJS
RCCP	Cedar Ridge Ministries	Cedar Ridge Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	28	28	6	21	Washington	20	DJS
RCCP	Children's Resources, Inc.	Big Pine Childrens Home - Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	14	14	7	16	Washington	7	DJS
RCCP	Children's Resources, Inc.	Shiningtree Childrens Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	14	14	7	16	Washington	7	DJS
RCCP	Florence Crittenton Services of Baltimore, Inc	Florence Crittenton Maternity Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	24	38	13	20	Baltimore City	4	DJS
RCCP	Hearts and Homes for Youth, Inc.	Hearts & Homes for Youth-Helen Smith Girls GH	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	3	DJS
RCCP	Hearts and Homes for Youth, Inc.	Hearts & Homes for Youth -John C. Tracey Grp Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	6	DJS



Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Hearts and Homes for Youth, Inc.	Hearts & Homes for Youth - Kemp Mill Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	7	DJS
RCCP	Hearts and Homes for Youth, Inc.	Hearts & Homes for Youth - Jump Start	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	8	8	17	20	Prince George's	7	DJS
RCCP	Alternatives for Youth and Families	Alternatives for Youth-The Lighthouse Girls TGH	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	8	6	12	17	Charles	4	DJS
RCCP	TuTTie's Place	TuTTie's Place	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	26	6	16	21	Baltimore City	1	DJS
RCCP	United States Fellowship, Inc	Oak Hill House-us Fellowship Inc	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	10	14	14	18	Washington	10	DJS
RCCP	Cumberland Central YMCA	Allegany County Girls Group Home	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	9	9	13	18	Allegany	6	DJS
RCCP	Kent Youth, Inc	Kent Youth Boys Group Home	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	10	10	14	18	Kent	10	DJS
RCCP	KHI Services	Karma Academy for Boys - Rockville	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	13	13	14	18	Montgomery	10	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	KHI Services	Karma Academy for Boys -Randallstown	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	8	8	14	18	Baltimore	6	DJS
RCCP	Koba Institute of Prince George's County, Inc	Koba Institute at Ft Washington	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	8	8	15	20	Prince George's	2	DJS
RCCP	Maple Shade - Special Projects	Maple Shade -Mardela Special Care-Ocean Gateway	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	10	18	Wicomico	1	DJS
RCCP	Mosaic Community Services, Inc	Mosaic I and II	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	12	18	Howard	1	DJS
RCCP	Maryland Sheriffs' Youth Ranch	Maryland Sheriff's Youth Ranch. Inc	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	28	18	10	18	Frederick	5	DJS
RCCP	Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	Maryland Salem Children's Trust Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	24	32	6	18	Garrett	1	DJS
RCCP	Maryland Salem Children's Trust, Inc.	Salem Residential Group Home (Western MD)			22	0	6	18	Allegany	7	DJS
RCCP	Our House Youth Home, Inc.	Our House Youth Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	16	16	16	21	Montgomery	16	DJS
RCCP	Guide Programs, Inc.	Guide- Therapeutic Group Home Baltimore City	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	6	6	13	18	Baltimore City	5	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RCCP	Hearts and Homes for Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes- Redl House	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	13	17	Montgomery	7	DJS
RCCP	Chesapeake Youth Center	The Way Home-Mt Manor	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	17	15	14	18	Baltimore City	6	DJS
RCCP	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation Headquarters	All That Matters, Inc. Foundation Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	8	8	14	19	Prince George's	1	DJS
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc	ARC of Washington County- Foundations	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	10	10	15	21	Washington	2	DJS
RCCP	ARC of Washington County, Inc	ARC of Washington County- Jefferson House	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	12	12	10	17	Washington	1	DJS
RCCP	Florence Crittenton Services of Baltimore, Inc	Florence Crittenton-Mother Infant Program	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	14	19	13	20	Baltimore City	1	DJS
RCCP	National Center for Children and Families	Greentree Adolescent Group Home	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	20	20	13	20	Montgomery	10	DJS
RCCP	Koba Institute of Prince George's County, Inc	Koba Institute Programs	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	40	8	13	20	Montgomery	8	DJS
RCCP	Maple Shade Youth & Family Services	Maple Shade - Royal Oaks	OHCQ	Therapeutic Group Home	8	8	10	18	Wicomico	1	DJS

**Family Home Setting**

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
Adoptive	Public Provider	Public Provider			0	0	0	0		98	DHR
Foster Care	Public Provider	Public Provider			0	0	0	0		1453	DHR
Foster Care		Castle, John and Nancy - Foster Care			3	0	10	18	Washington	1	DJS
Foster Care		Churchill, Christopher and SueAnn - Foster Care			1	0	0	0	Washington	1	DJS
Foster Care		Dale and Wanda Broadwater - Foster Care			1	0	13	18	Garrett	1	DJS
Foster Care		Dallas and Mary Bunch Foster Care			1	0	15	20	Allegany	1	DJS
Foster Care		Durst, Jennifer and Randall - Foster Care			2	0	0	0	Garrett	1	DJS
Foster Care		Joseph and Debra McCarney Foster Care			1	0	13	18	Washington	1	DJS
Foster Care		Thomas, Henry and Tiquita - Foster Care			2	0	0	0	Frederick	1	DJS
LA_FH	Public Provider	Public Provider			0	0	0	0		452	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
LA_FH	Brook Lane Health Services, Inc.	Brook Lane - Stone Bridge Transitional Care Respite	DHR	RCC: Respite	24	27	6	17	Washington	14	DHR
Relative Care	Public Provider	Public Provider			0	0	0	0		2314	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Lanham	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	20	0	0	21	Prince George's	23	DHR
TFC	Foundations for Home and Community, Inc.	Foundations For Home and Community CPA-Clinton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	120	0	0	21	Prince George's	91	DHR
TFC	PSI Services, Inc.	PSI Services -- Chevy Chase	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	20	0	0	21	Montgomery	2	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Easton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	25	0	0	21	Talbot	43	DHR
TFC	Center for Progressive Learning, Inc.	Center for Progressive Learning DDA	DDA	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	12	0	0	21	Baltimore	5	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland Caton Center TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	21	Baltimore	17	DHR
TFC	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services (Baltimore)	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	240	0	0	21	Baltimore City	25	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Project -- CPA Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	15	0	0	18	Wicomico	3	DHR
TFC	Unknown	Unknown			0	0	0	0		56	DHR
TFC	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne - Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	100	0	0	21	Baltimore	61	DHR
TFC	The ARC Of Baltimore, Inc.	Arc Of Baltimore Treatment and Specialized FC	DHR	CPA: TFC Medically Fragile	110	0	0	20	Baltimore	53	DHR
TFC	Residential Care, Inc.	Residential Care, Inc. Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	60	0	0	20	Baltimore City	65	DHR
TFC	The Children's Home, Inc.	The Children's Home Edgewood Street Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	45	0	0	21	Baltimore City	31	DHR
TFC	WIN Family Services, Inc.	WIN Family Services, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	100	0	0	21	Baltimore City	53	DHR
TFC	PSI Services, Inc.	PSI Services -- Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	46	0	0	21	Baltimore	47	DHR
TFC	Maple Shade Youth and Family Services, Inc.	Maple Shade TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	20	0	0	21	Wicomico	12	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	Second Home, Incorporated	Second Home CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	35	0	0	21	Baltimore City	24	DHR
TFC	Williams Life Center, Inc.	Williams Life Center, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	21	Prince George's	23	DHR
TFC	Neighbor to Family, Inc.	Neighbor to Family Sibling Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	95	0	0	21	Baltimore	74	DHR
TFC	Baptist Family and Children's Services of Maryland, Inc.	Baptist Family and Children's Services Columbia CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	60	0	0	21	Howard	39	DHR
TFC	Casey Family Services	Casey Family Services Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	21	Baltimore City	12	DHR
TFC	San Mar Children`s Home, Inc.	San Mar Children's Home Inc. TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	35	0	0	21	Washington	32	DHR
TFC	CONCERN - Professional for Children and Youth, Inc	CONCERN Lanham CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	12	0	0	21	Prince George's	61	DHR
TFC	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities, TFC, Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	82	0	0	21	Baltimore City	58	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Children's Choice Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	110	0	0	20	Baltimore City	44	DHR
TFC	Seraaj Family Homes, Inc.	Seraaj Family Homes - Riverdale CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	0	21	Prince George's	1	DHR
TFC	Pressley Ridge, Inc.	Pressley Ridge Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	21	Baltimore City	46	DHR
TFC	Pressley Ridge, Inc.	Pressley Ridge Cumberland	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	52	0	0	21	Allegany	24	DHR
TFC	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities, TFC,	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	82	0	0	21	Harford	14	DHR
TFC	Sheridan Patterson Center for Holistic Family Services, Inc	Sheridan Patterson Center CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	15	Baltimore	29	DHR
TFC	Alternatives for Youth & Families, Inc.	Alternatives for Youth & Families CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	8	0	0	0	St. Mary's	5	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland -	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	25	0	0	21	Baltimore	40	DHR



Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland -	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	25	0	0	21	Baltimore	119	DHR
TFC	The ARC Northern Chesapeake Region, Incorporated	ARC Northern Chesapeake Aberdeen	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	40	0	0	21	Harford	26	DHR
TFC	The Martin Pollak Project, Inc.	Martin Pollak Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	0	21	Baltimore City	82	DHR
TFC	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services (Hyattsville)	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	240	0	0	21	Prince George's	162	DHR
TFC	Hearts and Homes For Youth, Inc.	Hearts and Homes - Family Ties Treatment Foster Care	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	25	0	0	21	Montgomery	21	DHR
TFC	Board of Child Care of the United Methodist Church, Incorporated	Board of Child Care TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	27	0	0	21	Baltimore	21	DHR
TFC	The Children's Guild, Inc.	Children's Guild TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	60	0	0	21	Baltimore City	45	DHR
TFC	The Arrow Project Inc.	Arrow Project Treatment Foster Care Program	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	100	0	0	18	Baltimore	81	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Childrens Choice Stevensville	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	110	0	0	20	Queen Anne's	19	DHR
TFC	The Children's Choice Of Maryland, Inc.	Childrens Choice Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	110	0	0	20	Wicomico	16	DHR
TFC	Kennedy Krieger Institute, Inc.	Kennedy Krieger TFC Program	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	21	Baltimore City	77	DHR
TFC	The National Center for Children and Families, Inc.	National Center for Children and Families CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	0	21	Montgomery	21	DHR
TFC	Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization, Inc.	Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	29	0	14	21	Baltimore City	21	DHR
TFC	Progressive Horizons, Inc.	Progressive Horizons CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	0	21	Baltimore	15	DHR
TFC	Phoenix Homes, Inc.	Phoenix Homes CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	32	0	0	21	Baltimore	24	DHR
TFC	Good Children in the Making, Inc.	Good Children in the Making - Family Services TFC	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	18	0	0	21	Prince George's	8	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	Progressive Life Center, Inc.	Progressive Life Center, Inc. CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	21	Prince George's	40	DHR
TFC	Residential Care, Inc.	Residential Care, Inc. Crofton	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	48	0	0	20	Anne Arundel	5	DHR
TFC	Between Friends, Inc.	Between Friends -- Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	30	0	0	21	Baltimore City	27	DHR
TFC	Family and Children's Services of Central Maryland Inc.	Family and Children's Services of Central MD CPA	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	90	0	0	21	Baltimore City	21	DHR
TFC	Parker Therapeutic Services, Inc.	Parker Therapeutic Services - Baltimore	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	100	0	0	20	Baltimore City	59	DHR
TFC	KidsPeace National Centers of North America, Inc.	KidsPeace CPA - Columbia	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	50	0	0	21	Howard	36	DHR
TFC	MENTOR Maryland, Inc.	MENTOR Maryland - Salisbury	DHR	CPA: Treatment Foster Care	55	0	0	21	Wicomico	7	DHR
TFC	Mentor Maryland Network	Mentor Maryland - Easton Children's Services			80	0	0	0	Talbot	11	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	Foundations for Home and Community	Foundations for Home and Community	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	70	120	0	21	Charles	1	DJS
TFC	Maple Shade - Special Projects	Maple Shade After Care - Treatment Foster Care	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	0	20	2	21	Wicomico	2	DJS
TFC	Concern Professional Service for Children, Youth and Families	Concern - Treatment Foster Care	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	76	74	0	21	Prince George's	2	DJS
TFC	Pressley Ridge Schools	Pressley Ridge - Treatment Foster Care	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	35	107	4	20	Allegany	10	DJS
TFC	Alternatives for Youth and Families	Alternatives for Youth and Families- Phase I	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	0	0	16	21	St. Mary's	2	DJS
TFC	Alternatives for Youth and Families	Alternatives for Youth - TRIAD Care -TFC	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	24	16	6	21	St. Mary's	3	DJS
TFC	Mentor Maryland Network	Mentor Maryland - Baltimore Teens In Transition - TFC	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	45	60	13	21	Baltimore	3	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
TFC	Contemporary Family Services, Inc.	Contemporary Family Services, Inc	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	240	240	0	21	Prince George's	8	DJS
TFC	Hearts and Homes for Youth, Inc.	Hearts & Homes for Youth - Family Ties Treat FC	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	24	24	0	21	Montgomery	3	DJS
TFC	Arrow Project of Maryland	Arrow Project Of Maryland Foster Care	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	40	120	0	21	Baltimore	4	DJS
TFC	National Center for Children and Families	Greenleaf Treatment Foster Care	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	30	30	6	21	Montgomery	2	DJS
TFC	Baltimore Adolescent Treatment Guidance Organization, Inc.	B.A.T.G.O.	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	20	60	14	20	Baltimore City	1	DJS
TFC	Mentor Maryland Network	Mentor Maryland - Community Based Services	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	40	4	13	17	Baltimore City	33	DJS
TFC	Community Solutions, Inc.	Multi-Dimensional TFC (Baltimore County) - Community Solutions, Inc.	DHR	Private Treatment Foster Care Program	10	10	12	18	Baltimore	2	DJS
TFC	The Mentor Network	Mentor Maryland-Salisbury Teens In Transition - TFC	DHR	Private Independent Living Program	0	6	16	21	Dorchester	1	

**Hospitalization**

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
In-Patient	Unknown	Unknown			0	0	0	0		6	DHR
Psych	Unknown	Unknown			0	0	0	0		17	DHR
Psych	Spring Grove Hospital Center	Spring Grove Hospital Center	OHCQ	Acute Psychiatric Hospitalization	110	25	13	17		2	DJS
Psych	Adventist Behavioral Health	Potomac Ridge Eastern Shore Acute Unit			0	0	0	0	Dorchester	2	DJS
Psych	Adventist Behavioral Health	Potomac Ridge Behavioral Health Hospital-Rockville	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	20	88	14	16	Montgomery	1	DJS
Psych		Thomas Finan Center Adult Psychiatric Program			0	0	18	0	Allegany	1	DJS
Psych	Sheppard Pratt Towson	Sheppard Pratt Hospital Towson	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	40	8	12	21	Baltimore	1	DJS

**Non-Community Based Residential**

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
ASAM	AMP/CEP	Hilltop Recovery Center	OHCQ	General	0	34	0	0	Baltimore	4	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia Park Heights	OHCQ	General	0	170	0	0	Baltimore City	3	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia Owings Mills	OHCQ	General	0	80	0	0	Baltimore	8	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia	Gaudenzia at Woodland	OHCQ	General	0	240	0	0	Baltimore City	3	ADAA
ASAM	Right Turn of MD	Right Turn of MD	OHCQ	General	0	17	0	0	Baltimore	1	ADAA
ASAM	Right Turn of MD	Right Turn of MD	OHCQ	General	0	49	0	0	Baltimore	2	ADAA
ASAM	Right Turn of MD	Right Turn of MD	OHCQ	General	0	13	0	0	Baltimore	1	ADAA
ASAM	Marcey House	Marcey House	OHCQ	General	0	15	0	0	St. Mary's	3	ADAA
ASAM	Build Fellowship	DePaul House	OHCQ	General	0	10	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	I Can't We Can, Inc.	I Can't We Can	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	0	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Avery Road Combined Care	ARCC	OHCQ	General	0	20	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Safe Harbor & New Horizons	Mountain Manor - Safe Harbor & New Horizons	OHCQ	General	0	100	0	0	Frederick	8	ADAA

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
ASAM	Homecomings Project	Homecomings	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	0	Harford	1	ADAA
ASAM	Halfway Home	Halfway Home	OHCQ	General	0	14	0	0	Howard	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons - Hagerstown	OHCQ	General	0	90	0	0	Washington	2	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons-Central Laundry	OHCQ	General	0	256	0	0	Carroll	21	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons - MCIW	OHCQ	General	0	60	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons - Patuxent Institution	OHCQ	General	0	48	0	0	Howard	7	ADAA
ASAM	Gaudenzia, Inc.	Gaudenzia Prisons	OHCQ	General	0	90	0	0	Washington	2	ADAA
ASAM	South Baltimore Station	South Baltimore	OHCQ	General	0	50	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	The Jude House, Inc.	Jude House	OHCQ	General	0	42	0	0	Charles	2	ADAA
ASAM	Carroll County Health Dept.	Spectrum	OHCQ	General	0	96	0	0	Carroll	1	ADAA
ASAM	Shoemaker Center	Shoemaker Center	OHCQ	General	0	50	0	0	Carroll	3	ADAA
ASAM	The Carol M. Porto Treatment Center	Carol M. Porto Treatment Center	OHCQ	General	0	48	0	0	Calvert	2	ADAA



Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
ASAM	Powell Recovery Center	South Broadway	OHCQ	General	0	20	0	0	Baltimore City	3	ADAA
ASAM	Avery House for Women & Children	Avery House for Women & Children	OHCQ	General	0	10	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Recovery Network	Recovery Network	OHCQ	General	0	32	0	0	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Recovery Network	Recovery Network	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Recovery Network	Recovery Network Center	OHCQ	General	0	60	0	0	Baltimore City	2	ADAA
ASAM	Warwick Manor Behavioral Health, Inc.	Warwick Manor	OHCQ	General	0	6	0	0	Dorchester	9	ADAA
ASAM	Warwick Manor Behavioral Health, Inc.	Warwick Manor - Crest	OHCQ	General	0	16	0	0	Dorchester	1	ADAA
ASAM	Second Genesis, Inc.	Second Genesis Crownsville	OHCQ	General	0	288	0	0	Anne Arundel	4	ADAA
ASAM	Second Genesis, Inc.	Second Genesis Melwood	OHCQ	General	0	76	0	0	Prince George's	3	ADAA
ASAM	Kent CHD	A.F. Whitsitt Center	OHCQ	General	0	24	0	0	Kent	5	ADAA
ASAM	Washington CHD	Cameo House	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	0	Washington	2	ADAA

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
ASAM	Farther Martin's Ashley	Father Martin's Ashley	OHCQ	General	0	85	0	0	Harford	12	ADAA
ASAM	Mann House, Inc.	Mann House	OHCQ	General	0	13	0	0	Harford	1	ADAA
ASAM	Haven House, Inc.	Haven House	OHCQ	General	0	10	0	0	Cecil	1	ADAA
ASAM	Gale Houses, Inc.	Gale House	OHCQ	General	0	12	0	0	Frederick	2	ADAA
ASAM	Gale Houses, Inc.	Olson House	OHCQ	General	0	21	0	0	Frederick	1	ADAA
ASAM	Samaritan House	Samaritan House	OHCQ	General	0	15	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany CHD	Massie Unit (Women)	OHCQ	General	0	25	0	0	Allegany	1	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany CHD	Massie Unit	OHCQ	General	0	24	0	0	Allegany	3	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany CHD	Allegany House	OHCQ	General	0	11	0	0	Allegany	1	ADAA
ASAM	Walden Sierra, Inc.	Walden Sierra	OHCQ	General	0	42	0	0	St. Mary's	3	ADAA
ASAM	Tuerk House, Inc.	Tuerk House	OHCQ	General	0	70	0	0	Baltimore City	1	ADAA
ASAM	Avery Road Treatment Center	Avery Road	OHCQ	General	0	60	0	0	Montgomery	2	ADAA
ASAM	Hudson Health Services	Hudson Health	OHCQ	General	0	72	0	0	Wicomico	1	ADAA
ASAM	Addictions Recovery, Inc.	Hope House	OHCQ	General	0	70	0	0	Anne Arundel	3	ADAA

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
ASAM	Wells House	Wells House East	OHCQ	General	0	17	0	0	Washington	1	ADAA
ASAM	Lawrence Court	Lawrence Court	OHCQ	General	0	20	0	0	Montgomery	1	ADAA
ASAM	Chrysalis House, Inc.	Chrysalis House	OHCQ	General	0	45	0	0	Anne Arundel	3	ADAA
ASAM	Washington CHD	Catoctin Summit	OHCQ	General	0	20	0	17	Frederick	21	ADAA
ASAM	Allegany CHD	Jackson Unit	OHCQ	General	0	40	0	0	Allegany	37	ADAA
ASAM	Anne Arundel Medical Center	Pathways	OHCQ	General	0	8	0	17	Anne Arundel	3	ADAA
ASAM	Mountain Manor Treatment	Mountain Manor	OHCQ	General	0	30	0	17	Baltimore City	48	ADAA
ASAM	William Donald Schaefer House	William Donald Schaefer House	OHCQ	General	0	20	0	17	Baltimore City	18	ADAA
ASAM	Cornell Companies	Cornell Abraxas Intensive and Drug Sellers			266	0	12	18	OOS	1	DJS
ASAM	Keystone	Keystone Continuum LLC-Natchez Trace Youth Academy			85	0	12	18	OOS	3	DJS
ASAM	Rite of Passage	Canyon State Academy			208	0	11	18	OOS	11	DJS
ASAM	Sequel Youth Services	Clarinda Academy Residential Treatment Program			235	0	12	18	OOS	16	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
ASAM	The Academy System, Inc - Summit Academy	Summit Academy Inpatient Drug and Alcohol Prg			0	0	0	0	OOS	1	DJS
ASAM	Youth Centers	Meadow Mountain Youth Center			40	0	14	19	Garrett	40	DJS
ASAM	Glen Mills Schools	Glen Mills Schools (PA)	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	750	0	0	0	OOS	17	DJS
ASAM	VisionQuest National, Ltd	Morning Star Youth Academy	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	48	40	14	18	Dorchester	25	DJS
ASAM	Catoctin Summit Adolescent Program	Catoctin Summit Adol. Prog.	OHCQ	ASAM Level III.3 (American Society of Addiction Medicine)	20	25	14	21	Frederick	10	DJS
ASAM	Thomas B. Finan Center	Lois E. Jackson Unit-Addictions Program	OHCQ	ASAM Level III.7 (American Society of Addiction Medicine)	33	40	13	18	Allegany	12	DJS
ASAM	Chesapeake Treatment Center	Mountain Manor Drug Treatment Center	OHCQ	ASAM Level III.7 (American Society of Addiction Medicine)	0	88	13	20	Baltimore City	18	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
ASAM	Sequel Youth Services	Woodward Youth Corporation DBA, Woodward Academy	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	168	240	12	18	OOS	4	DJS
ASAM		William Donald Schaefer House	DJS		20	0	14	18	Baltimore City	2	DJS
ASAM	Rite of Passage	Rite of Passage - Silver Oak Academy	DJS	Private Residential Child Care Program	48	48	14	18	Carroll	35	DJS
Detention	Cheltenham Youth Facility Headquarters	Cheltenham Re-Direct			10	0	0	0	Prince George's	21	DJS
Detention	Youth Centers	Backbone Mountain Youth Center	DJS		48	0	14	19	Garrett	47	DJS
Detention	Youth Centers	Savage Mountain Youth Center			36	0	14	19	Allegany	23	DJS
Detention	Youth Centers	Green Ridge - Mountain Quest	DJS		10	0	14	18	Allegany	10	DJS
Detention	Youth Centers	Green Ridge Youth Center	DJS		30	0	14	19	Allegany	30	DJS
Detention	DJS Local Juvenile Services	Victor Cullen Center	DJS		48	0	14	19	Frederick	47	DJS
DETP	The Academy System, Inc - Summit Academy	Summit Academy - Diag./Sanctions (Send Referrals)			353	0	14	18	OOS	1	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
DETP		RICA - Rockville CEU Diagnostic			20	0	12	18	Montgomery	4	DJS
DETP		RICA Brief Assessment Unit, Rockville			5	0	12	18	Montgomery	1	DJS
DETP	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Children Diag Treat Center -CEU	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	55	16	12	17	Baltimore City	4	DJS
DETP	Lakeview NeuroRehabilitation Center - NH	Lakeview NeuroRehabilitation Center	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	0	0	6	17	OOS	1	DJS
DETP	Arrow Project of Maryland	Arrow Project Diagnostic Center	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	45	45	12	18	Baltimore	3	DJS
DETP	Children's Home	Children's Home Diagnostics Shelter (Female)	DHR	Private Residential Child Care Program	16	16	13	19	Baltimore	1	DJS
LA_NCB	Public Provider	Public Provider			0	0	0	0		100	DHR
Non-Secure	CCS of Lansing, Inc	CCS of Lansing, Inc. - Turning Point Youth Center			40	0	12	17	OOS	4	DJS
Non-Secure	Children and Family Services	Southwest Indiana Regional Youth Village - Regular Secure Program			312	0	9	18	OOS	1	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
Non-Secure	Cornell Companies	Cornell Abraxas Academy			0	0	0	0	OOS	1	DJS
Non-Secure	Mid-Atlantic Youth Services, Corp	Mid Atlantic Youth Services- Intensive Open Residential Treatment			0	0	0	0	OOS	2	DJS
Non-Secure	Mid-Atlantic Youth Services, Corp	Mid Atlantic Youth Services- Western PA Child Care			48	0	12	21	OOS	4	DJS
Non-Secure	Mid-Atlantic Youth Services, Corp	Mid-Atlantic Youth Services, Luzerne Co. Juv Ctr			60	0	12	18	OOS	7	DJS
Non-Secure	Waxter Children's Center Administrative	Waxter Children's Center(Maximum)Secure Treatment	DJS		10	0	15	18	Anne Arundel	4	DJS
ResEducation		Potomac Ridge- Ridge School, Anne Arundel			0	0	0	0	Anne Arundel	1	DJS
RTC	Glen Mills	Glenn Mills Group Home	OOS	Residential Treatment Center	1	1	0	20	OOS	2	DHR
RTC	Chesapeake Treatment Ctr.	Chesapeake Treatment RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	29	29	0	20	Baltimore	2	DHR
RTC	Kidlink-Pennsylvania Clinical Schools	Kidlink Group Home	DHR	Residential Treatment Center	5	5	0	20	OOS	2	DHR

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RTC	Coding Adjustment	Coding Adjustment			0	0	0	0		-6	DHR
RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Anne Arundel RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	14	26	0	20	Anne Arundel	14	DHR
RTC	Rica -Regional Institute For Children & Adolescents	RICA Baltimore RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	45	45	0	21	Baltimore City	15	DHR
RTC	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Center RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	54	54	0	20	Baltimore City	11	DHR
RTC	Good Shepherd Center	Good Shepherd Center RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	105	105	0	20	Baltimore	57	DHR
RTC	Associated Catholic Charities Inc.	Associated Catholic Charities -- Villa Maria RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	95	95	0	20	Baltimore	33	DHR
RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Eastern Shore RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	14	59	0	20	Dorchester	12	DHR
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt -- The Jefferson School RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	53	53	12	20	Frederick	24	DHR
RTC	Rica -Regional Institute For Children & Adolescents	RICA Rockville RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	80	80	0	21	Montgomery	7	DHR



Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RTC	National Children's Center, Inc.	National Children's Center Group Home	OOS	Residential Treatment Center	10	10	0	20	OOS	2	DHR
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Health System, Inc.	Sheppard Pratt Berkeley & Eleanor Mann RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	48	48	12	20	Baltimore	50	DHR
RTC	Adventist Healthcare, Inc.	Adventist Behavioral Health Rockville RTC	DHMH	Residential Treatment Center	13	88	0	20	Montgomery	14	DHR
RTC	Adventist Behavioral Health	Potomac Ridge Behavioral Health- Anne Arundel			26	0	13	17	Anne Arundel	7	DJS
RTC	Chesapeake Youth Center	New Directions Chesapeake Treatment Center- Hickey			26	0	15	21	Baltimore	21	DJS
RTC	Cornell Companies	Cornell Abraxas Youth Center - Firesetter's Prog.			36	0	12	18	OOS	3	DJS
RTC	Cornell Companies	Southern Peaks Regional Treatment Center			128	0	10	21	OOS	1	DJS
RTC	Keystone	Cottonwood Treatment Center			0	0	12	21	OOS	2	DJS
RTC		Macon Behavioral Health			54	0	6	21	OOS	1	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RTC		Pennsylvania Clinical Schools, Inc			108	0	13	21	OOS	3	DJS
RTC	RICA- Baltimore	RICA- Baltimore Residential Treatment Center	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	45	45	12	18	Baltimore City	4	DJS
RTC	Woodbourne Center, Inc.	Woodbourne Residential Treatment Center	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	54	0	0	0	Baltimore City	26	DJS
RTC	Sisters of Good Shepherd	Good Shepherd Center	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	104	105	13	17	Baltimore	25	DJS
RTC	Associated Catholic Charities Archdiocese of Baltimore	Villa Maria Residential Treatment Center	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	86	95	5	14	Baltimore	3	DJS
RTC	Adventist Behavioral Health	Potomac Ridge Behavioral Health - Eastern Shore	OHCQ	Acute Psychiatric Hospitalization	82	15	13	17	Dorchester	21	DJS
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Towson	Jefferson School	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	48	0	12	18	Frederick	8	DJS
RTC	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents	RICA - Rockville RTC	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	64	80	11	20	Montgomery	4	DJS
RTC	AdvoServ- Deleware	AdvoServ	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	60	0	0	0	OOS	2	DJS

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
RTC	Bennington School, Inc.	Bennington School - Intensive Care	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	120	0	10	18	OOS	2	DJS
RTC	Devereux Foundation	Devereux (Florida)	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	148	0	5	18	OOS	1	DJS
RTC	Devereux Foundation	Devereux (Georgia)	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	187	0	6	21	OOS	2	DJS
RTC	New Hope Carolinas, Inc	New Hope Carolinas - Residential Program	OOS	Private Residential Child Care Program	139	0	0	0	OOS	1	DJS
RTC	Pines Treatment Center	Pines Young Men's Center			10	0	0	0	OOS	2	DJS
RTC	Sheppard Pratt Towson	Sheppard Pratt Towson MANN RTC	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	17	48	12	21	Baltimore	6	DJS
RTC	Adventist Behavioral Health	Potomac Ridge Residential Treatment Center			75	0	12	18	Montgomery	8	DJS
RTC	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents- Baltimore	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	45	45	0	120	Baltimore City	37	MHA
RTC	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents	Regional Institute for Children & Adolescents- Rockville	OHCQ	Residential Treatment Center	80	80	0	120	Montgomery	32	MHA

**Unknown**

Subcategory	Organization Name	Provider Name	License Agency	License Type	Agency Capacity	Licensed Capacity	Age From	Age To	Jurisdiction	Total	Reporting Agency
Unknown	Unknown	Unknown			0	0	0	0		435	DHR
Unknown	Bennington School, Inc.	Bennington School - Special Intensive			0	0	0	0	OOS	1	DJS